INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS AND THE ANTIQUITY OF INDIAN ARTIFICIAL POETRY

4126

By

G. BÜHLER

Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture
University of Calcutta
1970

१२/-

4126

State Museum Library * Lucknow *

Reprinted from the *Journal of Ancient Indian History*, Vol. II (1968-69) and Vol. III (1969-70) published by the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, University of Calcutta, 51/2, Hazra Road, Calcutta-19.

PREFACE

The celebrated German savant, G. Bühler, to whom the study of Indian epigraphy owes an extremely heavy debt, published a very valuable monograph entitled *Die Indischen Inschriften und das Alter der Indischen Kunstpoesie*. It was translated into English by V.S. Ghate, and the translation appeared in the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XLII, 1913. We thought of reprinting the said translation in the pages of the *Journal of Ancient Indian History*, because it would greatly benefit the students of both epigraphy and the history of Sanskrit literature.

We have added some footnotes to the text, though the inaccuracies pointed out in some of them may be due to the printer or the translator and not to the author. To Bühler's superb treatment of the subject, we may add only two points. Firstly, the earliest Sanskrit inscription in *Kāvya* style, analysed by him, is the Junagadh inscription of the Śaka *Mahākṣatrapa* Rudradāman I, dated Śaka 72 (150 A. D.), while we have a few small epigraphic records containing Sanskrit stanzas in the Classical metres, and these belong to the age of the Śaka Satraps of Mathurā, who flourished about the beginning of the first century A. D. (cf. Editor's note at p. 83). Secondly, the only Prakrit inscription in *Kāvya* style, which has been analysed by Bühler, is the Nāsik *praśasti* of the 19th regnal year of the Śātavāhana king Vāsiṣṭhīputra Puḷumāyi (c. 130-59 A. D.), though the credit of being the earliest such Prakrit epigraph actually goes to the Hāthigumphā inscription of king Khāravela of Kaliṅga, who flourished in the latter half of the first century B. C. This is a partly damaged record first noticed in the *Asiatic Researches*, Vol. XV, 1825, and many scholars have written on its text for more than a century between the first serious attempt at decipherment in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. VI, 1837, and the last in our *Select*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

Inscriptions, Vol. I, 1942 and 1965. Thus the beginning of *Kāvya* literature may be pushed back a little further on the basis of epigraphic evidence than Bühler's examination of inscriptions suggested.

The index of the present volume has been prepared by Dr. S. P. Singh, a Junior Research Fellow at the Centre of Advanced Study in Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University, to whom our sincere thanks are due.

D. C. SIRCAR

Carmichael Professor and Head of the Dept. of Ancient Indian History and Culture and Director of the Centre of Advanced Study in AIHC, Calcutta University.

Dept. of Ancient Indian History
and Culture, Calcutta University,
51/2, Hazra Road, Calcutta-19.
December 1, 1969.

Contents

Subject *Page*

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. Vatsabhaṭṭi's *Praśasti* 9

III. Hariṣeṇa's Panegyric of Samudragupta ... 33

IV. Girnar Inscription of the Reign of *Mahākṣatrapa* Rudradāman 50

V. Nasik Inscription No. 18, dated in the Nineteenth Regnal Year of Śrī-Pulumāyi 63

VI. Conclusions and their Bearing on the Theory of Renaissance of Sanskrit Literature ... 76

INDEX 97

INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS AND THE ANTIQUITY OF INDIAN ARTIFICIAL POETRY

I

Introduction

Indian epigraphy which, since the last fifteen years, has received a new impulse, and which, thanks to the progress of Sanskrit philology as well as to the perfection of the methods of getting inscriptions in large numbers, leads to more certain results than in earlier times, has already provided us with several important particulars of elucidating the literary and religious history of that part of the world which is inhabited by the Brāhmaṇas and which wants a history as such. On the one hand, we owe to it particular and very important data which definitely fix the time of prominent authors ; as for instance, recently the time of the dramatic poet Rājaśekhara, whose pupils and patrons, the kings Mahendrapāla and Mahīpāla ruled during the last decade of the ninth and in the beginning of the tenth century of the Christian era, as shown by Fleet and Kielhorn. On the other hand, the comparison of the partly insignificant notices in the inscriptions with the accounts of literary tradition or with the data or conditions of the present day, permits us to have an occasional peep into the development of all the types of literature and of all the religious systems, a peep whose worth is considerably significant in the absence of really historical details. Such, for instance, is the observation that the tradition about the home of several Vedic Schools and also of the works belonging to them, is confirmed through the statements in the old land-grants, inasmuch as these mention not only the names of the donees but their secular and spiritual families. Not less significant for the history of the very important, though little regarded in earlier times, religion of Mahāvīra-Vardhamāna is the demonstration, gradually rendered feasible, that his followers, the Nirgranthas or Jainas, are mentioned in a number of inscriptions which run on from the beginning of the historical period of India, with but rare interruptions, and that the assertions in their canonical works, about the divisions of the Monks' Schools, are made reliable, to the most part, through writings of the first century of the Christian era. These hitherto published results are, however, only a small part of what the inscriptions may possibly yield to us. An accurate working out and a fuller estimate of the hitherto published materials, little in extent though they be, will show that one can procure valuable information from them, in all the departments of Indian research; and that their results furnish specially sound proofs for the theories about the development of Indian intellectual life, theories which the Indologists build on very weak foundations, compelled as they are by sheer necessity. This treatise is a small contribution towards the examination of inscriptions in this spirit. Its aim is to establish firmly those results which the inscriptions yield for the history of Indian *kāvya* or the artificial poetry of the court, as also to demonstrate how far the same agree with the new opinions regarding the development of this species of literature. My reason for undertaking to treat this question, before other perhaps more interesting and less disputed questions, is the recent publication of the Gupta inscriptions by J. F. Fleet in the third volume of the *Corpus*

Inscriptionum Indicarum. This exceedingly important work offers a larger number of wholly or partly metrical inscriptions with absolutely certain dates. The same, taken together with some documents already made known through reliable publications or editions allow us to prove the existence of *kāvya* literature in Sanskrit and Prakrit during the first five centuries of our era, and to show that a great period of literature, which brought into general prominence the style of the poetic school of Vidarbha or Berar, lies before the middle of the fourth century A. D. They also make it very probable that the year 472 A.D. is to be fixed as the *terminus ad quem* for the poet Kālidāsa.

Such conclusions would, no doubt, appear quite unimportant and scarcely worth the trouble of a special inquiry to those searchers who busy themselves with the history and literature of the European peoples. The Indologist, however, is unfortunately not in that happy position to look down with contempt, even upon such general results. Because, the history proper of Indian Artificial Poetry begins not earlier than in the first half of the seventh century A.D., with the reign of the mighty king Harṣa or Harṣavardhana of Thanesar and Kanauj, who is known to have ruled over Northern India in 606-47 A. D. The works of his favourite court poet Bāṇa-bhaṭṭa, who tried to portray the life of his master and of himself in the incomplete historical novel *Harṣacarita,* and who besides wrote, as we know for certain, the romance *Kādambarī* and the poem *Caṇḍīśataka,* and perhaps also the drama *Pārvatīpariṇaya,* are the oldest products of the court-poetry whose composition, no doubt, falls within the narrow limits given above. Before this time, there exists no *kāvya* as such, whose age is hitherto determined with some accuracy and certainty or allows itself to be determined with the accessible documents. Only of one work which shows, throughout, the influence of the *kāvya* style and which contains several sections entirely written in that style, we mean Varāhamihira's metrical Manucal of Astrology, the *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, it can be said with confidence that it is written about the middle of the sixth century, because Varāhamihira begins the calculations, in his *Pañcasiddhāntikā*, with the year 505 A. D., and he is supposed to have died in the year 587 A. D. according to the statement of one of the commentators. As to when the most celebrated classical poets Kālidāsa, Subandhu, Bhāravi, Pravarasena, Guṇāḍhya and the collector of verses Hāla or Śātavāhana lived, we possess no historical evidence. We can only say that the wide spread of their renown is attested for the first half of the seventh century by the mention of their names by Bāṇa and of Kālidāsa and Bhāravi in the Aihole-Meguti inscription of 634 A. D. ; and some of them, like Guṇāḍhya, to whose work Subandhu alludes repeatedly, must certainly have belonged to a considerably early period. Besides this, there are anecdotes, only poorly attested, as well as sayings of very doubtful worth ; and the scanty details contained in the poems themselves which might serve as stepping stones for determining their age, are very difficult to be estimated, because the political and literary history of India during the first five centuries of our era lies very much in obscurity. When the age of the most important poets is so absolutely uncertain, it is but natural that the case should be in no way better with the general question of the age of the *kāvya* poetry. In the literature, we come across very meagre traces which point to the fact that the artificial poetry was cultivated from earlier times ; and to our great regret, even the age of the most important work in which quotations from *kāvyas* occur, we mean the *Mahābhāṣya*, is in no way above doubt. Thus it is not improbable that these quotations might be left unheeded as being witnesses little to be trusted as some of the most important inquirers have already done and that theories, not taking notice of the same, might be put forth, which shift the growth of the artificial poetry to a very late age. Under these circumstances, it can be easily seen why I make myself bold to claim some interest for the evidence based upon the testimony of inscriptions, in favour of a relatively high antiquity of the artificial poetry.

The materials which the third volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* offers for this inquiry, are not insignificant, and comprise not less than 18 numbers whose dates are certain or at least approximately determinable, the age of their composition lying roughly between 350 and 550 A. D. The assiduous labours of Fleet and Dikshit, about the astronomically calculable dates of the Gupta inscriptions, irrefutably show that the beginning of the Gupta era falls 241 years later than that of the Śaka era, and for the reduction of the Gupta to the Christian era they leave us just the option of adding 318 or 319 years. Fleet has tried to show that the year 319 or 320 A. D. marks the beginning of the Gupta era. R. G. Bhandarkar, on the other hand, advocates 318 or 319, and for important reasons. For a literary-historical inquiry, it is of course of little importance as to which of these suppositions is the right one. The first king who makes use of the Gupta era is Candragupta II, named Vikramāditya, whose inscriptions and coins show the years 82*-94 or 95, i.e., 400-13 or 401-14 A. D. Of the reign of his father Samudragupta, there are two inscriptions, not dated. These belong to the latter half of the fourth century and, as regards Fleet's No. I, it can be asserted that it was composed when Samudragupta had already ruled for many years, because the number of his exploits eulogised therein is very considerable. Fleet's supposition that this inscription must have been composed after Samudragupta's death rests, as it will be shown in details below, on a wrong interpretation of the expression "Samudragupta's glory had gone up to heaven". As for the documents dated according to the Mālava era, the detailed expositions of Peterson and Fleet leave no doubt that the era is identical with the Vikrama era of 58-57 B. C. The age of several undated numbers can be determined, as Fleet has shown, by the comparison of their contents with those of the dated numbers. If we arrange chronologically the numbers important for our inquiry, we may have the following list.—

---

* [Now we have his Mathura inscription of the 5th regnal year and of the Gupta year 61 (*Sel. Ins.*, 1965, pp. 277 ff.—D.C.S.]

1. No. I.—Hariṣeṇa's panegyric of Samudragupta, composed sometime in 375-390 A. D.,[1] on the Allahabad pillar, consisting of 9 verses and the rest in high, elevated prose, at the close named a *kāvya*.

2. No. II.—Fragment of a poetic description of Samudragupta, composed sometime between 353-390 A. D.[2]

3. No. IV.—An undated fragment of a poetic description of four early Gupta kings, of the reign of Candragupta II, Gupta-saṁvat 82-94 (or 95).

4. No. VI.—The small, wholly metrical, undated inscription in Vīrasena's cave at Udayagiri, of the same period.

5. No. X.—The inscription on Dhruvaśarman's pillar at Bilsad, composed partly in high prose and partly in metre, dated Gupta-saṁvat 96, i. e., 414 or 415 A. D., in the reign of Kumāragupta (Gupta-saṁvat 96-130 = 414-15 to 448-49).

6. No. XVII.—The long composition, from Mayūrākṣaka's well in Gangdhar, dated Saṁvat 480 (?) = 423-24 (?) A. D., of the reign of king Viśvavarman.

---

[1] [350-76 A.D.—D.C.S.]

[2] [Middle of the 4th century A.D.—D.C.S.]

7. No. LXI.—The small metrical inscription from Śaṅkara's cave at Udayagiri, dated Gupta-saṁvat 106 = 424 or 425 A. D.

8. No. XII.—The undated, partly metrical inscription on the pillar at Bihar, of the reign of Skandagupta, Gupta-saṁvat 136-49, i. e., 454-67 or 455-468 A. D.

9. No. XIII.—The undated inscription on the pillar at Bhitari, which is partly in high prose and partly in metre, of the same period.

10. No. XIV.—The long, wholly metrical rock inscription at Junagadh, which mentions the Gupta years 136-38 = 454-56 or 455-57 A. D., and is called a *grantha*.

11. No. XV.—The wholly metrical inscription on Madra's pillar at Kahaum, dated Gupta-saṁvat 141 = 459 or 460 A. D.

12. No. XVIII.—Vatsabhaṭṭi's wholly metrical *praśasti* about the Sun temple at Mandasor, dated Mālava-saṁvat 529 = 473-74 A. D.

13. No. XIX.—The wholly metrical inscription on the pillar of Mātṛviṣṇu and Dhanyaviṣṇu at Eran, dated Gupta-saṁvat 165 = June 21, 484 A.D., of the reign of Budhagupta.

14. No. XX.—The short, wholly metrical, inscription on Goparāja's tomb-stone at Eran, dated Gupta-saṁvat 191 = 509 or 510 A. D., of the reign of Bhānugupta.

15. No. XXXIII.—Vāsula's undated, wholly metrical, panegyric of king Yaśodharman, on a pillar at Mandasor, spoken of as *ślokāḥ,* and engraved by the same stone mason who incised the following dated inscription.

16. No. XXXV.—The wholly metrical *praśasti* on Dakṣa's well at Mandasor, composed in the Mālava year 589 = 533-34 A.D., in the reign of king Yaśodharman-Viṣṇuvardhana.

17. No. XXXVI.—The inscription of Dhanyaviṣṇu's boar-statue at Eran, of the year 1 of king Toramāṇa, composed partly in verse and partly in high prose.

18. No. XXXVII.—The wholly metrical panegyric on Mātṛceṭa's temple of Viṣṇu in Gwalior, from the year 15 of the reign of Mihirakula who, according to No. XXXIII, verse 6, was a contemporary of Yaśodharman.

It would be perhaps possible to augment this list by the inclusion of some other documents, as for instance, the Meherauli pillar inscription of emperor Candra (No. XXXII) and the poetically coloured genealogy of the Maukharis on the Asirgadh seal (No. XLVII) which, according to the character of their writing, belong to this period. But those already mentioned quite suffice for our purpose. Their number shows that during the period 350-550 A.D., the use of the *kāvya* style in inscriptions, especially in the longer ones, was in vogue, and from this very cicumstance it follows that court poetry was zealously cultivated in India. It will be seen further on that this conclusion is confirmed by other indications of no doubtful character. Our next and most important task is, however, to inquire how far the samples of the *kāvya* style contained in the inscriptions agree with the works of the recognized masters of Indian poetics and how the same are related to the rules in the manuals of poetics. A full discussion of all the numbers mentioned would in the meanwhile be too detailed and of but little use. It would suffice to select a poem that falls in the beginning of the period and another that belongs to the close of the same, as representatives, and to go through the same thoroughly. With the rest, only a few important points will be prominently touched upon. On similar grounds, I take up, for purpose of a detailed discussion, No. I (Hariṣeṇa's panegyric of Samudragupta) and No. XVIII (Vatsabhaṭṭi's *praśasti* on the Sun temple at Daśapura or Mandasor); and immediately turn myself to the latter.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

II

Vatsabhaṭṭi's Praśasti

Vatsabhaṭṭi's composition consists of 44 verses, not to mention the two 'blessings' or *maṅgalas* in prose form at the beginning and at the end. The whole can be divided into sections, as follows—

1. The *maṅgala* addressed to the Sun in verses 1-3 of which the first and the third belong to the type of what is technically called *āśis* or *āśirvāda* (blessings), while the second verse falls under the category of *namaskṛti* or *namaskāra* (salutation).

2. A poetic description of the guild of the silk-weavers of Daśapura-Mandasor, verses 4-22, in which descriptions of their early fatherland Lāṭa or Gujarāt, and of their later home Daśapura, are interwoven.

3. A poetic picture of the suzerain Kumāragupta, verse 23.

4. The same of his vassals Viśvavarman and Bandhuvarman, the rulers of Daśapura, verses 24-28.

5. A short description of the temple built by the weavers, verses 29-30.

6. The mention of the date of its construction with a poetic description of the winter season, when the temple was consecrated, verses 31-35.

7. A postscript narrating a restoration of the edifice demolished in parts, with a mention of the date of this event and a description of the season when it took place, verses 36-42.

8. A wish that the temple may last for ever, verse 43.

9. The name of the poet, verse 44.

If one compares these contents of the composition in question with the sample I have presented in *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Vol. II, pp. 86 ff., it will be seen clearly that this composition belongs to that class of *praśastis* (encomiums or panegyrics), of which the recent epigraphical researches have brought to light such a large number. The composition itself provides us with a clear indication that the poet wished to have his work called by that name. For verse 44 says—"By the order of the guild and owing to their devotion, was built this temple of the Sun ; and the above was composed, with great troubles,[3] by Vatsabhaṭṭi."

'The above' (*pūrvā*) is an expression which occurs frequently in later inscriptions of this type and which must be supplemented by the word *praśasti* as Fleet also remarks in the note to this verse. The fact that the actual title of the composition is not mentioned, but is only indicated, proves that in Vatsabhaṭṭi's time there were many such *praśastis* and that it was a familiar custom in the fifth century, to glorify the erection of temples and other edifices, by means of such occasional compositions.

Another interesting point in the foregoing verse is Vatsabhaṭṭi's assurance that he composed his work *prayatnena* 'with a great effort'.[3] By this he means to say, no doubt, that he utilized with care the best samples and strove to observe very carefully the rules of poetics and metre. This careful study and this effort to do justice to the pretensions of the art of court poetry are to be marked in every verse. The very eagerness with which the author takes advantage of every little circumstance to bring in poetic details and descriptions, shows that he wished to do his best to make his composition resemble a *mahākāvya*. The science of rhetorics prescribes that a *mahākāvya* should contain descriptions of cities, oceans, mountains, seasons and so on. Thus Vatsabhaṭṭi is not

---

[3] ['With great care'.—D.C.S.]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

dissuaded from devoting one verse (4) even to the early home of his patrons, the Lāṭa country, casually mentioned as it is. The city of Daśapura, of course, receives more space and is glorified in nine verses (6-14). The descriptions of the two seasons, of winter in verses 31-33 and of spring in verses 40-41, also find a place, as, to give the date completely, the month must be mentioned, and this naturally serves as an occasion for an excursus on the season in which the month falls. The examination of the metres used by Vatsabhaṭṭi and of his style would likewise show what great troubles he had taken, though, of course, the product is only of a mediocre type.

Next to proceed to the versification, there is a frequent change of the metres, which are sometimes very artificial. We have the following metres used—(1) *Anuṣṭubh* 34-37, 44 ; (2) *Āryā* 4, 13, 21, 33, 38-39, 41-42 ; (3) *Indravajrā* 17, 26 ; (4) *Upajāti* 10, 12, 128 ; (5) *Upendravajrā* 7-9, 24 ; (6) *Drutavilambita* 15 ; (7) *Mandākrāntā* 29 ; (8) *Mālinī* 19, 43 ; (9) *Vaṁśastha* 23 ; (10) *Vasantatilakā* 3, 5-6, 11, 14, 18, 20, 22, 25, 27, 30-35, 40 ; (11) *Śārdūlavikrīḍita* 1-2 ; and (12) *Hariṇī* 16. Of these, *Vasantatilakā* is the most frequently used, i. e., in as many as fourteen verses. The frequent change of metre finds, without doubt, its explanation in nothing but the writer's desire to show his skill in the art, as otherwise the *praśasti* itself never demands it. In such compositions, a single metre is used, with a second in the concluding verse or verses, the *mahākāvyas* presenting exactly similar phenomena. Sometimes we find that the whole of a *kāvya* comparatively short in extent, or a section of a long *kāvya* presents only one metre ; sometimes there is one general metre with a different metre used at the close only ; in other cases, again we see a large number of different metres used. One thing that is striking in Vatsabhaṭṭi's versification is the frequent use of the weak pause which occurs in ten *Vasantatilakā* verses, in two in *Upendravajrā* and in one in *Āryā* (verse 33). In the last case, it stands at the end of a half-verse, where it is never found used by good poets, as far as I know. Vatsabhaṭṭi has thus made himself guilty of awkwardness. Other cases wherein he commits offences against the rules of grammar or of rhetorics will be mentioned later on. As regards the form of the composition, it is to be further mentioned that often two or more verses form a *yugalaka*, a *viśeṣaka* or a *kulaka*. *Yugalakas* or *yugmas* are instanced in verses 21-22, *viśeṣakas* in verses 4-6, 23-25, 26-28, and *kulakas* in verses 6-14, 31-35, 36-51. This peculiarity is also very frequently met with in all *mahākāvyas*.

Vatsabhaṭṭi's diction shows many marks which characterise, according to Daṇḍin, the poets of the Eastern School. First of all, he makes use of long compounds, which cover a *pāda* or more than a *pāda* or even the whole of a half-verse. Instances of the last type occur in verses 4, 6, 8, 14, 32, 41, while those of the first and second type are much more frequent. The whole of verse 33 consists of one single compound. If one compares Daṇḍin's illustration of the style of the Gauḍas,[4] with our verses 32-33, the resemblance would be unmistakable. Secondly, the writer, in his attempt to bring the sound of the words into harmony with the sense, shows in one and the same verse a mixture of soft and hard-sounding syllables, as is allowed only by the poets of Eastern India. Verse 26 runs thus—

tasy = ātmajo sthairya-nay-opapanno
bandhu-priyo bandhur = iva prajānām |
bandhv-arti-hartā nṛpa-Bandhuvarmā
dviḍ-dṛpta-pakṣa-kṣapaṇ-aika-dakṣaḥ ||

'His son is king Bandhuvarman, endowed with firmness and statesmanship, dear to the brothers, a brother, as it were, to his people, removing the sufferings of the relations, the only man skilful in destroying the proud hosts of enemies.'[5]

---

[4] *Kāvyādarśa,* I. 82.

Here, there is a change of the *rasa* or poetic sentiment. The first three *pādas* describe Bandhuvarman's wisdom and goodness, the last his terribleness in war with the enemies. Corresponding to this, the words in the first three quarters of the verse consist of syllables which are soft or light to be pronounced, in consideration of the necessity of the alliteration of the name Bandhuvarman. The fourth *pāda*, on the other hand, where the *raudra-rasa* prevails, contains only hard-sounding syllables and agrees quite well with Daṇḍin's typical illustration—

nyakṣeṇa kṣapitaḥ pakṣaḥ kṣatriyāṇāṁ kṣaṇād = iti.[6]

While explaning *Samatā* or evenness of form required for the Vaidarbhī *rīti*, Daṇḍin mentions[7] the different types of letters which a verse can have and illustrates the same with examples. As the last example, he gives a half verse (49b) in which every *pāda* has a different combin tion of letters corresponding to the change of sentiment, and Daṇḍin further adds, in verse 50, that this sort of change or unevenness was in vogue only amongst the Easterners.

Of *Śabdālaṁkāras* or figures of words, Vatsabhaṭṭi uses only the *Anuprāsa* or alliteration. The letter-alliteration or *Varṇānuprāsa* occurs in every verse. The *Padānuprāsa* or repetition of the same word in different senses is found more seldom. The verse above (26) is an instance, where the word *bandhu* is repeated thrice in honour of the king Bandhuvarman. It is to be noticed that Kālidāsa in his brief accounts of the Raghu kings Nabhas, Puṇḍarīka, Kṣemadhanvan, Ahīnagu and others, plays on their names exactly in a similar manner.[8] In *praśastis*, this sort of play on names is met with occasionally. One should specially compare the above-mentioned Lākhāmaṇḍala *praśasti*, wherein almost everything is provided with a play on the name. A second instance of the *Padānuprāsa* occurs in the beginning of the first verse in *siddhaiḥ siddhy-arthibhiḥ*, a third in verse 2 in *kinnara-naraiḥ*, a fourth in verse 18 where the first *pāda* ends with *vaṁśā* and the second *pāda* begins with the same syllable, a fifth in verse 25 in *anāthanāthaḥ*, and a sixth in verse 37 in *atyudāram = udārayā*.

---

[5] [*Bandhu*=friend.—D.C.S.]

[6] *Kāvyādarśa,* I. 72.

[7] *Ibid.,* I. 47-94a.

Of the *Arthālaṁkāras* or figures of sense, the author frequently uses only the most familiar ones, viz. *Upamā*, *Utprekṣā*, and *Rūpaka* or the identification of two similar things. In the phrase *siddhaiḥ siddhy-arthibhiḥ*, already mentioned above, a *Virodhālaṁkāra* or Oxymoron appears to be attempted, and a *Dhvani* (see below) is contained in verse 9. It would be little interesting to enumerate severally the *Upamās*, *Utprekṣās* and *Rūpakas* which the composition presents. Far more instructive would be the attempt to place the most important images and turns of expression side by side with similar ones in the *kāvyas* and thus to show that quite a number of expressions characteristic of the *kāvya* style occur in Vatsabhaṭṭi's *praśasti*.

Even the praise of the Sun in the *maṅgala* contains several points of relationship with passages in classical poems which are devoted to the glorification of the same god. The first two strophes :

1. 'May the Light-giver (*Bhāskara*), the cause of the destruction and origin of the world, protect you, the god, whom the host of gods worship, for purpose of their own preservation, the *Siddhas* (the accomplished), because they

---

[8] *Raghuvaṁśa,* XVIII. 5, 7, 8, 13 and so on (6, 8, 9, 14 according to the Nirṇaya Sāgara ed.).

strive for higher accomplishments, the *Yogins* entirely given to meditation, and having their objects of desire under their control, because they long for liberation, and the sages rich in severe penance, powerful through their cursing as well as favouring, from deep devotion of the heart !'

2. 'An adoration to the Generator (*Savitṛ*), whom even the zealous Brāhmaṇa sages, knowing the truth, do not fully[9] comprehend ; who supports the three worlds with his far-reaching rays ; whom the *Gandharvas*, gods, *Siddhas*, *Kinnaras* and men, praise as he rises ; who fulfils the desires of his devotees !'

comprise briefly the ideas which are met with in the Purāṇas, in the writings of the Sauras, which identify the Sun with the world spirit, and even in still older works. Amongst the court poets there is one Mayūra, in whose *Sūryaśataka*, a prayer addressed to the Sun, we have almost every one of the ideas contained in the verses above, repeated and with much the same form of expression. As Vatsabhaṭṭi praises the Sun as being the generator and the destroyer of the world, so also Mayūra identifies him, in verse 99, with Brahman, Viṣṇu and Śiva, the three gods who generate, preserve and destroy the universe. As the *praśasti* speaks of the worship of the Sun and of the prayers offered to him at dawn, so also does the *Sūryaśataka* frequently emphasise the idea that men and spiritual beings adore the Sun in the morning, only with this difference that the number of the divine and semi-divine beings, that bring their adoration to the Sun, is much larger therein. In verse 13, the Sun's rays are praised by the seers amongst gods. According to verse 36, the lustre of the rising Sun is eulogized by the *Gandharvas* both in prose and verse, as also by Nārada and other beings of antiquity. According to verse 81, prayers are offered to the Sun in the morning, by the *Siddhas*, gods, *Cāraṇas*, *Gandharvas*, *Nāgas*, *Yātudhānas*, *Sādhyas* and princes amongst sages, by each in his own peculiar way. So also, the *Sūryaśataka* often dwells on the thought that the Sun nourishes the gods and the world,—a thought already suggested by the Vedic name of the Sun-deity, viz., *Pūṣan*—and that he makes them free from the bonds of transmigration or re-birth. As for this latter point, verse 9 says of the Sun's rays that they are the boats which carry men through the fearful ocean of existence, the source of great sufferings. Further, the Sun's orb is described in verse 80, as 'the boat for the *Yogins* across the ocean of existence', and in verse 73, as 'the door of the liberated'. So also the Sun is depicted with special fulness as the nourisher of men and gods and as the maintainer of the entire order of the world (verse 87). The same thought is more briefly expressed in verse 77, where the Sun's orb is named 'the life principle of the world'. It may be added that in the older works of Varāhamihira also we meet with the thoughts expressed in the beginning of our *praśasti*. Thus in the first verse of the *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, the Sun is invoked as 'the generator of the world' and as 'the soul of the universe', and in the first verse of the *Yogayātrā*, as 'the soul of embodied beings', and as 'the door of liberation'.

---

[9] [Fleet takes *kṛtsnaṃ* as an adjective of *loka-trayam*.—D.C.S.]

The third verse of the *maṅgala* :

3. 'May the Illuminator (*Vivasvat*) protect you, adorned with the beautiful ornaments of rays,—the god whose circle of rays shines forth daily, coming over from the high, expansive summit of the mountain of the East, and who is lovely like the cheek of an intoxicated woman !'—

compares the reddish morning sun with the reddened cheeks of a drunk *Nāyikā*. This comparison is quite characteristic of the court poets, who are never tired of describing or alluding to the revels of their heroes with their wives in the harem. Even in the *kāvya* literature, this comparison is very often found used in connection with the rising as well as the setting sun of the day. Thus, for instance, Bāṇa says in the beginnnig of a description of the evening : 'when the day went down, the day whose light became as soft as the cheek of a Mālava woman, reddened with the intoxication of wine,' etc. (*Harṣacarita*, p. 212). Bāṇa's comparison is somewhat more nicely brought out than that of Vatsabhaṭṭi, owing to the use of the term 'Mālava woman' in place of the general expression *aṅganā-jana*. The later poets make use of specific expressions, almost everywhere.

The following verses (4-6) describe the emigration of the silk-weavers from Lāṭa, the middle Gujarāt, to Daśapura, wherewith short descriptions of Lāṭa and of the environs of the city are interwoven. These do not rise above the level of mediocrity and have nothing remarkable. Of course, Daśapura, as we commonly see the cities described in the *kāvyas*, is called the beauty-mark (*tilaka*) on the forehead of the province, and this province also, which is named *bhūmi*, the earth, is imagined to be a female. Accordingly, the trees bending under the burden of flowers are spoken of as her ear-crests, and the thousands of mountains, as her ornaments. So also as befits the *kāvya* style, the mountains are spoken of as tricking with the juice flowing from the temples of wild elephants.

The same remarks also apply to the following verses (7-9), in which further the lakes and gardens of Daśapura are spoken of. The description contains only the most usual expressions that are found used in *kāvya* in a similar connection. The lakes are full of blooming water-lilies, and lively with ducks and swans. The water near their banks is variegated with the flowers fallen from the trees. The swans therein are tawny-brown owing to the pollen fallen from the lotuses shaken by the fickle waves. The trees bending under the burden of their flowers, the humming of the bees bold with the intoxication of honey and the incessant singing of the city-women walking for pleasure, make the groves lovely. It is to be noticed here that the description of the bees no doubt reminds us, through *dhvani*, of the bold and intoxicated lovers of the beautiful women. The following verse, on the other hand, with which begins the description of the city is considerably more interesting.

10. 'Where the houses towering high, of the purest whiteness, with flying flags and trim women, quite resemble the peaks of silvery clouds variegated with flashes of lightning.'

Vatsabhaṭṭi has given himself great pains to bring out the best possible resemblance between the houses and the clouds and thus to excel the parallels frequently used in the *kāvyas*. This fact is specially proved by the double application of the word 'lightning flash'. He is not merely content with describing the lighting flash as the mistress of the cloud, dancing before the house for a moment, as Indian poets do very often ; but he portrays the same as the gay flags waving over the houses. There can be little doubt that Vatsabhaṭṭi intended in this to surpass some poet known to him, and we can hardly help thinking that he had before him the description of the palaces in Alakā, which Kālidāsa gives in the beginning of the *Aparamegha* in the *Meghadūta*. The verse runs thus—

Vidyutvantaṁ lalita-vanitāḥ s-endracāpaṁ sacitrā
saṅgītāya prahata-murajāḥ snigdha-gambhīra-ghoṣam |
antas-toyaṁ maṇimaya-bhuvas = tuṅgam = abhraṁlih-āgrāḥ
prāsādās = tvāṁ tulayitum = alaṁ yatra tais = taiḥ viśeṣaiḥ ||

'Where the palaces can match themselves with you (the cloud) by means of these and other particulars—their lovely, fair inhabitants resemble your lightnings, their gaily coloured portraits, your rainbow, their drums struck for concert, your lovely, deep thunder, their jewelled floors, the shimmering drops of water that you hide, their terraces towering up to the clouds, your height.'

In the view that Vatsabhaṭṭi tried to compete with Kālidāsa, we are still further confirmed, if we observe that in the next verse he adds all the details met with in Kālidāsa, which are left out in verse 10. In that verse, he says :

11. 'And [where] other [houses] resemble the high summits of the Kailāsa, with long terraces and stone-seats, resounding with the noise of music, covered with gay pictures, and adorned with groves of waving plantain trees.'

The agreement of thought and imagery is thus quite complete. Only, Vatsabhaṭṭi says something more, and it is what we expect of an imitator and a rival. It goes without question that Vatsabhaṭṭi's verses are on a lower level than those of his model.

The next verse also, in which the description of the houses is further elaborated quite in an insipid manner, presents one point worthy of notice.

12. 'Where the houses adorned with rows of stories, resembling gods' palaces, of pure lustre like the rays of the full-moon, raise themselves up, having torn open the earth.'

Here, the statement that 'the houses raised themselves up, breaking through the earth' is quite striking. If this expression means anything, it suggests a comparison of the houses with something to be found in the deep or the nether world, with something like the thousand white-shining heads of Śeṣa. Such an image is, however, defective, when there is already a comparison of the houses with the *vimānas*, the moving gods' palaces, soaring up high in the sky. The difficulty, I think, may be solved by supposing that Vatsabhaṭṭi has confounded, with little understanding, two comparisons used by the poets of his time. The comparison of houses with the *vimānas* of gods is not rarely found in epic works, but is still more frequently met with in the *kāvyas*. On the other hand, that of buildings with things in the nether world comes only as now and then in artificial poetry. Thus in Kālidāsa's *Raghuvaṁśa*, XII. 70, we have—

> *sa setuṁ bandhayāmāsa plavagair = lavaṇ-āmbhasi |*
> *rasātalād = iv = onmagnaṁ Seṣaṁ svapnāya Śārṅgiṇaḥ ||*

'He (Rāma) had a bridge built by the monkeys on the salt ocean,—the bridge which was, as it were, the serpent Śeṣa, coming up out of the nether world, to serve as a bed for Viṣṇu.'

So also in Māgha's *Śiśupālavadha*, III. 33, we have—

> *madhye-samudraṁ kakubhaḥ piśaṅgīr =*
> *yā kurvatī kāñcana-vaprabhāsā |*
> *turaṅga-kāntā-mukha-havya-vāha-*
> *jvāl = eva bhitvā jalam = ullalāsa ||*

'In the midst of the ocean, tinging with yellow-red, the regions, with the lustre of its golden ramparts, the city (Dvārakā) shone forth, like the flame of fire from the mouth of the mares, breaking up through the waters.'

It can be further seen that Vatsabhaṭṭi, in spite of the great labours he has undertaken for his poem, has committed several offences against good taste; and thus we would not be unjust to him, if we suppose that, in this case, in his eagerness to bring in many figures of speech, he was tempted to confound in quite an unintelligible manner, two comparisons current in the literature of his time.

Not less interesting is the following verse of the *praśasti*—

13. 'Surrounded by two charming rivers of tremulous waves, the city resembles the body of the God of Love, which

[his wives] Prīti and Rati, with prominent breasts, embrace in secrecy.'

The idea of the rivers looked upon as females is a very natural one. It is very frequently met with in the *kāvyas*. Thus Subandhu in his *Vāsvadattā* (p. 102, lines 1-2) says of the Vindhya mountain : *Revayā priyatamay = eva prasārita-vīci-hastay = opagūḍhaḥ*, 'It is surrounded by the Revā (Narmadā) as by a beloved with the arms in the form of waves stretched forth.' Even a more exact parallel we have in a passage alike referring to the Vindhya, in the above-mentioned hymn of Agastya (*Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, XII. 6)—

rahasi madana-saktayā Revayā kāntay = ev = opagūḍham, 'whom the Revā embraces like an ardent beloved'. Even though it may not be certain that Vatsabhaṭṭi lived before Varāhamihira, one would be tempted to conjecture a close connection between his verse and that of the *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*. The real fact seems to be that all the three poets imitated some well-known model.

In the last verse in connection with the description of the city, we meet with a simile which is rarer—

14. 'With its Brāhmaṇas, who are conspicuous with truthfulness, self-control, mental quietude, the observance of their vows, purity, firmness, the study of the Veda, pure conduct, modesty and understanding, and possess no other treasures than knowledge and penance and yet are free from pride, shines forth this city like the sky with its multitudes of bright, glowing planets.' Nothing similar to this, in the old *kāvya* literature is known to me. On the other hand, in many works and in the *praśastis*, we often see conspicuous persons compared to the Moon or the Sun, and their family to the heavens. In a later work, the *Prabhāvakacarita* ('The Life of Hemacandra', p. 54) there is found the comparison of a poet with the planet Mercury (Budha).

In the following description of the guild of silk-weavers,

4126

which possesses more of historical than of poetical worth, there are, on the one hand, several particular expressions, and, on the other hand, some general assertions, which are quite characteristic of the *kāvya* style. Thus in verse 15, we have the figurative use of the verb *jṛmbh* in the phrase *aharahaḥ pravijṛmbhita-sauhṛdāḥ*, 'whose friendship augmented more and more everyday'. So also the compound *śravaṇa-subhaga*, 'pleasing to the ear' (verse 16), should be compared with *netra-subhaga*, 'pleasing to the eye' (verse 21), and *pratāpa-subhaga*, 'pleasing on account of warmth' (verse 31). *Subhaga* is particularly used by Kālidāsa very often in the sense of 'beautiful, lovely, pleasing' at the end of compound words. Other poets also use the word similarly though more rarely. Further, we must notice the second half of verse 17 :

ady = āpi c = ānye samara-pragalbhāḥ
kurvanty = ariṇām = ahitaṁ prasahya ||

'And, even to-day, others, courageous in war, effect by force the destruction of their enemies.' Here the wording which expresses the simple fact that some members of the weaver-class served as soldiers, is exactly as it is required in artificial poetry ; and the words *samara-pragalbhāḥ*, and *prasahya*, of which latter the position also is to be observed, are quite characteristic of artificial poetry.

With verse 23, begins the description of the princes of Daśapura and their suzerain, wherein, at the very threshold we are face to face with quite a rush of images and turns of expression very frequently used by artificial poets.

23. 'While Kumāragupta ruled over the earth, which is circumscribed by the four oceans as by a moving girdle, whose high breasts the mountains Sumeru and Kailāsa are, and which smiles with the flowers in full bloom coming from the woods.'

24. 'King Viśvavarman was the protector [of Daśapura], who is equal to Śukra and Bṛhaspati in wisdom [and] is the ornament of the kings on this earth, performed exploits in the battles, like Pārtha.'

The metaphor of the girdle and the breasts of the earth is absent from no Indian poet. The only thing to be noted in our passage is that Vatsabhaṭṭi selects for the comparison the most important mythical mountains. Probably, the Himavat and Vindhya which are otherwise frequently referred to in this connection appeared too trivial to him, not to mention his desire to surpass his predecessors. The third metaphor of the smile in the form of flowers is also not a rare one. So also the compounds *samudr-ānta* and *van-ānta* are quite characteristic ; in them the word *anta* has, really speaking, no meaning. The word *van-ānta*, as the passages quoted in the great *Petersburg Lexicon* show, is very frequently used in the sense of 'forest-region, forest' in the epics as well as in *kāvya* literature. *Samudr-ānta*, on the other hand, signifies only 'sea-shore' in other places. But this sense would not do in the present case. For the shores are really included in the earth ; and it is only the rocking oceans that can suitably be represented as the swinging, moving girdle. Thus, on the analogy of *van-ānta*, *samudr-ānta* appears to be used in the sense of 'the surface of the ocean' ; and it is very probable that the compound is used only for the exigency of the metre.

Equally noteworthy is the figurative use of the word *vānta*, so favourite with the court poets, which Daṇḍin treats of in the *Kāvyādarśa*, I. 95-97, and sanctions as *ati-sundaram*. Of the comparisons in verse 24, that of the king with Pārtha or Arjuna is very familiar ; so also is the comparison with Śukra and Bṛhaspati, the teachers and Purohitas of the Asuras and the gods respectively. In the second verse referring to Viśvavarman (verse 25), the comparison of the king with the Tree of Paradise, yielding all the desires, stands out prominently, a comparison which the needy poets, as is well known, apply very frequently to kings in order to stimulate their generosity. Verse 26 with which begins the description of Bandhuvarman has been discussed above. In the following verse, there occurs the stereotyped comparison with the God of Love, which the poet has taken troubles to make even more emphatic by the use of several epithets :

27……'Of a graceful form,[10] he shines forth, though not wearing ornaments, by virtue of his beauty, as if he is the second God of Love.'

Even the last verse contains a description of the terrible character of the king, very frequently recurring in the *kāvyas* :

28. 'Even to-day, when the beautiful, long-eyed wives of his enemies, afflicted as they are by these pangs of widowhood, remember him, a painful, violent tremour tortures their full breasts.' With this may be compared, for instance, *Raghuvaṁśa*, IV. 68 ; *Subhāṣitāvalī*, Nos. 2482, 2535. Still more frequently are the pangs of the wives of the enemies described, in the *praśastis*, with various modes of expression.

As for the description of the temple, it is naturally (verse 30) 'resembling a mountain', 'white like the pure rays of the moon that has risen up', and 'quite comparable to a lovely jewel on the crest of the western city'. After the restoration of the temple, it is said (verse 38) to be 'touching the sky, as it were, with its beautiful turrets', and 'the receptacle of the spotless rays of the sun and the moon, at their rise', i. e., reflecting their rays. At last in verse 42, the poet assures us—

'As the heaven with the moon, and the bosom of

---

[10] Literally 'incarnation of sexual love'.

Śārṅgin with the *kaustubha* jewel shines in pure lustre,[11] so does the whole of this stately city embellished with this best of temples. The similes and modes of expressions occurring in these verses also belong to the repertory of the artificial poets.

The last points in our inscription, which deserve special attention, are the descriptions of the two seasons. Of these, that of the winter in the *kulaka* formed by verses 31-35 runs thus—

31. 'In the season, wherein the houses are full of beautiful women, which is pleasant on account of the feeble rays of the Sun, and the warmth of fire, when the fish conceal themselves deep under water, when the rays of the Moon, the top floors of houses, sandal ointment, palm-fans and pearl-necklaces afford no enjoyment, when the hoar-frost burns down the water-lilies,'

32. 'In the season, which is made lovely by the swarms of bees rejoiced by the juice of the opened flowers of the *rodhra*, the *priyaṅgu* tree and the jasmine creeper, when the solitary branches of the *lavalī* and of the *nagaṇa*, dance under the force of the cold wind full of frost,'

33. 'When the young men counteract the effects of frost and snow-fall, by fast embracing the massive thighs, the lovely breasts and the bulky hips of their beloveds,'

34. 'When four hundred and ninety-three years had passed, according to the reckoning of the Mālavas, in the season when one should derive pleasure from the high breasts of women,'

35. 'On the auspicious thirteenth day of the bright half of the month of Sahasya was this temple consecrated with the ceremony of auspicious benediction.'

---

[11] [Fleet takes *vimalaṁ* as an adjective of *nabhas*.—D.C.S.]

The *Ṛtusaṁhāra*, V. 3, corresponds to a part of the first verse in this description—

na candanaṁ candra-marīci-śītalaṁ
na harmya-pṛṣṭhaṁ śarad-indu-nirmalam |
na vāyavaḥ sāndra-tuṣāra-śītalā
janasya cittaṁ ramayanti sāmpratam ||

'Neither the sandal-ointment cooling like the rays of the moon, nor the terrace pure bright like the autumnal moon, nor the winds cold with dense frost, pleasure at present the minds of men.'

The idea of our verse 33 and of the close of verse 34 is expressed in the *Ṛtusaṁhāra*, V. 9, thus—

payodharaiḥ kuṅkuma-rāga-piñjaraiḥ
sukh-opasevyair = nava-yauvan-oṣmabhiḥ |
vilāsinībhiḥ paripīḍit-orasaḥ
svapanti śītaṁ paribhūya kāminaḥ ||

Also verse No. 3925 in Śārṅgadhara's *Paddhati* bears a very great resemblance to the ideas contained in the verses before us—

prāleyaśaila-śiśir-ānila-saṁprayogaḥ
protphulla-kunda-makaranda-hṛt-āli-vṛndaḥ |
kālo=yam=āpatati kuṅkuma-paṅka-piṅga-
prottuṅga-ramya-ramaṇī-kuca-saṅga-yogyaḥ ||

'Now comes the season, which brings cold winds from the snow-mountains, when the swarms of bees are attracted by the juice of the jasmine in full bloom, when one should cling close to the high breasts of charming beloveds, breasts which are coloured yellow with saffron ointments.

Similar verses are found not seldom; and one may refer to the *Sārṅgadharapaddhati*, Nos. 3924, 3937, and *Vikramāṅkacarita*, XVI. 3 ff., 47-49, as parallels in point. In connection with verse 32, it must be added that 'the dancing of the branches or the creepers, owing to the wind' is a favourite idea in the *kāvyas*, an idea which is sometimes found very much elaborated. Thus, in the *Kirātārjunīya*, IV. 14-17, we have an elaborate description of the creepers as dancing women of the woods; with this, we may also compare Kālidāsa's *Vikramorvaśīya*, Act II, verse 4. The description of the spring, which comes in connection with the statement that the restoration of the temple was accomplished in the month of Tapasya or Phālguna (February-March), is shorter in length and presents fewer characteristic features—

40. 'In the season, when the arrows of the god whose body is purified by Hara, increase in their might, as they verily become one with the visible, fresh, blooming blossoms of the *aśoka*, the *ketaka*, the *sinduvāra*, the moving *atimukta* creeper and the *madayantikā*,'

41. 'In the season, when the solitary, large branches of the *nagaṇa* are resounding with the music of the swarms of bees delighted by the drinking of honey, when the lovely exuberant *rodhra* is thickly set with flowers newly bursting forth.'

The most noteworthy point here is the identification of the five kinds of flowers with the five arrows of the God of Love. This idea is frequently met with in the *kāvyas*, and still more prominent is the fact that the spring is described as making ready the weapons for Kāma.

Thus in the *Kumārasaṁbhava*, III. 27, we have—

sadyaḥ-pravāl-odgama-cāru-patre
nīte samāptiṁ nava-cūta-bāṇe |
niveśayāmāsa Madhur = dvi-rephān =
nām-ākṣarāṇ = īva Manobhavasya ||

'As the arrow of the fresh mango-blossom, with tender sprouts serving as feathers, was made quite ready, Madhu set thereon the dark bees, which were, as it were, the letters of the name of the God of Love.'

The same thought is more simply expressed in the verse quoted by Ānandavardhana in the *Dhvanyāloka*, II. 28 (p. 106 of the text in the *Kāvyamālā* series) and in the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*, No. 3789. The names of the flowers, however, do not wholly agree with those which, according to the familiar idea, are supposed to form the tips of the arrows of Kāma. Probably the author has intentionally chosen other names, because he misplaces the beginning of the spring in the closing part of the *Śiśira* or the cold season whose last month is Tapasya or Phālguna.

What we have said so far is sufficient to establish the fact that Vatsabhaṭṭi was acquainted with the rules of Indian poetics and that he tried to satisfy the demands thereof, so that his *praśasti*, in form as well as in sense, strictly belongs to the domain of Sanskrit artificial compositions. From this we can further deduce, without hesitation, the conclusion that in his time there existed a considerably large number of *kāvyas*, from whose study he cultivated himself, upon which he drew and with which he tried to compete now and then. The rightness of this supposition is confirmed by many circumstances. Thus, Vatsabhaṭṭi was not at all a man to whom we can give the credit of originality ; nor can we name him as a poetic genius capable of giving new ideas. He shows the several weaknesses which characterise the poets of the second or third class, who compile their verses laboriously, after the model of the great Classical poets. A number of points, which can illustrate this, have been already discussed above, and can be still further multiplied. Thus he uses expletives and particles not rarely, and never minds the fault of tautology, just in order to complete his verse. To the first category belongs *prakāśam* (verse 5), *sametya* (verses 5 and 15), *tatas=tu* (verse 22), the above-mentioned *anta* in *samudr-ānta* (verse

23), and *tīr-ānta* (verse 7), so also the altogether meaningless prefixes *prati* and *abhi* in *prativibhāti* (verse 3) and *abhivibhāti* (verse 19); likewise we meet with quite striking tautologies; e. g. in *dhyān-aikāgra-paraiḥ* (verse 1), where however, the synonymous words *ekāgra* and *para* may perhaps be supposed to be put together in order to make the idea of the complete merging clearer and more emphatic; but, in *tuly-opamānāni* (verse 10), it is very difficult even to find an appearance of excuse for the simultaneous use of the two synonymous words. Further, Vatsabhaṭṭi commits offences against grammar, for purposes of metre. A slight mistake of the kind is the use of the *Ātmanepada* in *nyavasanta* (verse 15), instead of the *Parasmaipada*, though this may perhaps be excused owing to its similar use in epic poetry and on the ground of analogous mistakes met with in the *kāvyas*. Far worse, however, is the use of the masculine form *spṛśann=iva* instead of the neuter *spṛśad=iva* (verse 31), which has to agree with the substantive *gṛham* (verse 37). Fleet, of course, proposes to write *spṛiśat=īva*; but it would not at all suit the metre. Besides, with this alteration, the whole construction would not only be changed, but broken up into pieces, because then the locatives, in verses 39-40, would be altogether hanging in the air. With the text as we have it, *saṁskāritam*, 'was repaired' (verse 37), is the verb in the principal sentence with which, all the following words, which are attributes of the time, can be quite rightly connected. If, however, we write *spṛśat=īva*, this itself, then, becomes the principal verb and thus we must translate the stanzas as follow :—

37. 'This temple of the Sun, which the generous guild caused to be built up again, in all its parts, very stately, in order to further their renown,'

38. 'That temple, which was exceedingly high, glowing white, the resting place of the pure rays of the Sun and

the Moon at their rise, touched, as it were, the sky, with its charming turrets.'*

Here the sentence is complete, and there is no verb with which the following words, 'after five hundred and twenty-nine years had passed, on the second day of the bright half of the lovely month of Tapasya' can be construed. Thus Vatsabhaṭṭi cannot be freed from the charge of having used a wrong gender, out of regard for the metre. We may suppose that he might have been conscious of the fault, but that he might have consoled himself with the beautiful principle :

māṣam=api maṣaṁ kuryād=vṛtti-bhaṅgaṁ vivarjayet,

according to which the correctness of the metrical form precedes every other consideration.

We can easily believe him as capable of such blunders, for, in the second half of verse 30—

yad=bhāti paścima-purasya niviṣṭa-kānta-
cūḍāmaṇi-pratisamaṁ nayan-ābhirāmam ||

we come across something worse, a fault in construction. The genetive *paścima-purasya* goes with *cūḍāmaṇi*, and there is no substantive which is connected with *niviṣṭa*. The grammatically correct form should have been *paścima-pure* ; but that would not have suited the metre. To the category of poetical absurdities, not specially alleged, belong verses 7-8, where at first *sarāṁsi* 'the lakes', in general, is used ; then again *kvacit sarāṁsi*, 'the lakes in some places', is used. Further in verses 10-12, the poet first speaks of *gṛhāṇi*, 'the houses', then again of *anyāni*, 'other houses', and lastly again of *gṛhāṇi*, 'the houses', in general.

Notwithstanding all these facts, it cannot be denied that Vatsabhaṭṭi was a versifier perhaps learned, but

---

*[See *Sel. Ins.*, p. 306, note 3 (*spṛśat=tv=iva*).—D.C.S.]

clumsy and little gifted. This conclusion appears in no way surprising, if we remember that he never lived at the court of his native place Daśapura, but was a man of limited means or of moderate circumstances. If Vatsabhaṭṭi would have been able to boast of a place at the court of Bandhuvarman or even of a mere connection with him, he would not have failed to let posterity know of the same or at least to praise his master as a patron of poetry. As nothing like this is done by him, we would not be wrong in supposing that he was a private man of learning, of the type found in all Indian cities, that he had specially studied the worldly lores and that he was not ashamed of making money by composing a piece of poetry occasionally, even when such a low class of people as the silk-weavers required his services.

Thus it is quite evident that the points of affinity with the Classical literature, which are presented by a composition originating from such a man as Vatsabhaṭṭi are possessed of great significance. When we know that Vatsabhaṭṭi was not an original genius, but only a man who sought, with great effort in the sweat of his brow, to compile a medley of the Classical modes of expression and exerted himself, though with little success, to play variations on the same or to improve upon them, then the supposition cannot be gainsaid that, in the fifth century, there existed a *kāvya* literature quite similar to that known to us already. This conclusion is still further confirmed by the fact that all the above *praśastis* in Fleet's volume which were composed between the year 400 and the year of Vatsabhaṭṭi's composition, present the same close relations to the *kāvyas* known to us. We agree that a large number of these is no doubt of an insignificant character, and is written by private men of learning of the province, as, for instance, the Daśapura *praśasti* ; but there still remains the stamp of the *kāvya* on them. One of the few pieces which show a higher talent, is Fleet's Number VI. Although the first two verses are very much distorted, still it can be unmistakably seen that it is written in a high style and by a real poet. The fragments of the first verse—

*yad = antar-jyotir = ark-ābham = urvyām** UU—U—/
* * * * U—*vyāpi Candragupt-ākhyam = adbhutam* //1*

remind us to Gaṇadāsa's words in Kālidāsa's *Mālavikāgnimitra* : *mahat khalu puruṣ-ādhikāram = idaṁ jyotiḥ* // In the conclusion which is better preserved, the author gives his name and applies to himself the title of *Kavi*. It runs thus—

tasya rājādhirājarṣer = acinty-ojjvala- karmaṇaḥ /
anvaya-prāpta-sācivyo vyāpṛtaḥ Sāndhivigrahaḥ[12] //3
Kautsaḥ Śāba iti khyāto Vīrasenaḥ kul-ākhyayā /
śabd-ārtha-nyāya-lokajñaḥ kaviḥ Pāṭaliputrakaḥ //4
kṛtsna-pṛthvī-jay-ārthena rājñ = aiv = eha sah-āgataḥ /
bhaktyā bhagavataḥ Śambhor = guhām = etām = akārayat //5

3-4. 'Vīrasena, known by the family name of Kautsa Śāba, well-versed in grammar, politics, logic and the course of the world, a poet, living in Pāṭaliputra, who served as a hereditary minister to the sage-like king of kings who performed deeds, inconceivable and bright,'

5. 'Came here [to Udayagiri] with the king himself who intended to conquer the whole earth, and caused this cave to be constructed, out of devotion for the divine Śambhu.'

The poet Vīrasena lived about the year 400 A.D.; for, as Fleet's No. III shows, Candragupta II had conquered the province of Malwa in the middle of the Gupta year 82, i.e., 400-01 or 401-02 A.D. Thus the invasion, in which Vīrasena accompanied his master, could be undertaken not later than (but rather earlier) in the beginning of the year mentioned above. At this time, Vīrasena, as the verses above state, was the minister of foreign affairs. That a minister occupied himself with poetry leads us to conjecture that Candragupta II Vikramāditya looked upon the Muses with favour or that poetry had at least the right to appear at Court.

---

* [Cf. *Sel. Ins.*, p. 280 (*urvyām=bhāti nirantaram* | *divā-vibhāvarī-vyāpi*).—D.C.S.]

[12] [Fleet suggests *vyāpṛta-sandhivigrahaḥ*. This has been left out in the following translation.—D.C.S.]

III

Hariṣeṇa's Panegyric on Samudragupta

The second of the inscriptions which we are going to examine, Hariṣeṇa's panegyric of Samudragupta, presents many points of close touch with the *kāvya* literature preserved and proves in the clearest manner that court poetry was a subject most assiduously cultivated in the fourth century A.D. Hariṣeṇa's panegyric covered originally thirty lines and a half, and consisted of eight verses in the beginning, a long prose passage and a concluding verse. All the three parts together form one single gigantic sentence. Unfortunately, the four lines in the beginning containing two verses have been entirely lost and lines 4-16 have been distorted more or less, so that we have only one of the introductory verses, in a complete form. The subscription of the author in lines 31-33 informs us that not only the metrical lines but the whole of the composition is to be regarded as *kāvya*. It is said there—

'And may this *kāvya*, of the slave of the feet of this same lord,[1] whose intelligence was expanded by the favour of dwelling near [His Majesty], the minister of foreign affairs, and the counsellor of the royal prince,[2] the great General Hariṣeṇa, the son of the *Khādyaṭapākika*[3] and the great General Dhruvabhūti, lead to the welfare and happiness of all beings. The accomplishment of the same was, however, looked after[4] by the great General Tilabhaṭṭaka who meditates with reverence on the feet of his lord.'

---

[1] I.e. of the king Samudragupta. Fleet's supposition that Candragupta II is meant is grammatically not allowable.

Thus, this little composition of Hariṣeṇa belongs to the class of mixed compositions which, in poetics, are frequently called by the name *campū*, while the oldest works preserved for us, such as the *Vāsavadattā*, *Kādambarī*, *Harṣacarita* and *Daśakumārcarita* are called by the name of *ākhyāyikā* or *kathā*, 'a narration, a romance'. It possesses a certain relationship with the descriptions of kings which are found in the *ākhyāyikās*. Similar to these[5] last, the description, in the present case, consists of one sentence with many adjectival as well as appositional phrases and a number of relative sentences. As will be shown later on, there are many agreements in respect of details. But, besides, Hariṣeṇa's composition presents its peculiarity or special character in several respects. This comes out in the grouping of the elements and especially in the skill in bringing out a connection of the praise of Samudragupta with the pillar on which the inscription has been worked out. The last part which forms the very foundation for the compilation of the whole work, and the concluding verse, deserve a detailed examination not only for this reason, but also for the fact, which will be seen if they are rightly understood, that the inscription was not composed, as Fleet assumes, after the death of Samudragupta. They are to be translated in the following manner, according to my interpretation—

---

[2] The title *Kumārāmātya*, 'counseller or minister of the royal prince' corresponds probably to the title at present in use in Gujarāt, i.e. *Kumvarjīno kārbhārī*, 'the manager of the prince'. In all the great courts in Kāṭhiāwāḍ and Rājputānā, the adult princes as well as the Chief Queens have their own *kārbhārīs* who look after their private affairs. The minister of an Andhra queen is mentioned in the Kaṇheri inscription No. 11 (*Arch. Surv. Rep. W. Ind.*, Vol. V, p. 78). [*Kumārāmātya* seems to be an *Amātya* enjoying the status of a *Kumāra*.—D.C.S.]

[3] I take this word to be a title, which, however, I am not able to explain. [The correct designation seems to be *Khādyakūṭapākika*.—D.C.S.]

[4] The expression *anuṣṭhitam* will signify that Tilabhaṭṭaka who, as his title and name show, was a Brāhmaṇa of a high military rank, superintended the preparation of the fair copy and the engraving of the text; cf. the use of the word at the end of the Girnār inscription of Rudradāman discussed below.

[5] See, for instance, *Kādambarī*, ed. Peterson, pp. 5-6, 53-56; *Harṣacarita*, Kashmir ed., pp. 162-79, 227-28, 267-71, and especially *Vāsavadattā*, ed. Hall, pp. 121, where, in the midst of prose, four verses have been interwoven.

Lines 30-31—'This high pillar is, as it were, the arm of the earth raised up, which announces that the fame of Samudragupta, the illustrious lord of great kings, greatly augmented through the conquest of the whole earth, filled the whole surface of the earth, and found a lovely, happy path in that it wandered from this world to the place of the lord of gods.'[6]

Verse 9—'And the glory of this [ruler], which rises up in layers one above the other, through his generosity, his bravery of the arm, his self-control, and his perfection in the science of letters, and which follows more than one path, purifies the three worlds, like the white waters of the Gaṅgā, which rises up in even higher floods, follows more than one path, and dashes forth rapidly freed as it is from the imprisonment in the inner hollow of the braid of hair of Paśupati.'

---

[6] For the sake of comparison, I give Fleet's translation of this passage, which differs from mine—'This lofty column is as it were an arm of the earth, proclaiming the fame—which having pervaded the entire surface of the earth, with [its] development that was caused by [his] conquest of the whole world, [has departed] hence [and now] experiences the sweet happiness attained by [his] having gone to the abode of [Indra] the lord of the gods—of the *Mahārājādhirāja*, the glorious Samudragupta.' The points requiring explanation are: (1) the addition of *has departed* and *and now*, (2) the translation of *vicaraṇa* by *experiences*, and (3) the insertion of *his* (i.e. of the king) before *having gone*.

For the explanation of this translation, the following should be noticed.

1. The word *ucchrita* (line 30) refers to the arm as well as the pillar, for it is only the raised arm pointing to heaven that can announce the fact that the king's glory has gone up there. The poet here has the *śleṣa* or paranomasia in view, and the word is, therefore, to be translated twofold. It is possible that the word *ucchrita* as taken with the pillar may mean 'erected [just here]' instead of 'high'; but to decide which of the two meanings is intended we must know further particulars regarding the composition of the inscription.

2. As regards the translation of the word *vicaraṇa* by 'path', it is to be observed that the synonyms *caraṇa, gamana* and *yāna* are given in this sense in the Petersburg lexicon, and that this sense is justified by the statements of the grammarians about the suffix *ana*. According to them, the suffix *ana* serves to denote the means; and the path is, according to the Indian conception, one of 'the means of going'.

3. The adjectival phrases *uparyupari-sañcay-occhrita* and *aneka-mārga* must be translated in two ways like *ucchrita*, because they refer both to the glory and to the river, Gaṅgā. As applied to glory, the first compound means that Samudragupta's generosity, bravery, self-control and knowledge of the letters form the layers by which the

glory towers itself up to the height of a mountain, and that every quality that follows, is higher and more excellent. As applied to the Gaṅgā, the adjective alludes to the Indian belief that this river is first visible in the heavens as the milk-path, then dashing through the mid-region, it falls upon the Kailāsa and lastly it rushes downwards to the plains. Thus to the looker-on, standing on the plains and looking upwards, the water of the Gaṅgā would appear to be towering in ever-rising layers. *Anekamārga*, literally 'which has more than one path', as applied to glory, means not only that the glory travelled in the three worlds, but that it followed different paths in the sense that it sprang from different causes such as generosity and so on. As applied to the Gaṅgā, the word has only the first sense and it is well known that the Gaṅgā is called *Tripathagā.*

According to the translation given above, the last part of the panegyric tells us that Samudragupta's fame, which is personified as is frequently met with in Indian poems, occupied the whole earth, and thus found it impossible to spread forth any more on this sphere. Thus embarrassed, the fame went up to the palace of the lord of gods and there found a new path for itself, along which it moved happily. Verse 9 informs us of the result which was brought about by this ascent to heaven. Then, says the poet, the king's glory attained to a similarity with the Ganges. For, like the same, it flows through the three worlds : heaven, mid-air and earth. Every one of these thoughts and images occurs frequently in the works of court poets. Almost in every *praśasti* and in a large number of *cāṭus* or verses containing flattery, it is told that the glory of the king under description rushes forward into heaven. The most usual expression used to convey this thought is the statement that the glory of such and such a person fills up the three worlds. There are many places, however, where the ascent of fame, as is here spoken of, and the figurative motives for the same are also given in different ways. Thus, it is said in a verse of the poet Amṛtadatta, who was a contemporary of the Kashmirian Sultān Shihābuddīn (c. 1352-70 A. D.), in the *Subhāṣitāvalī*, No. 2457 (Peterson's ed.)[7]—

kīrtis = te jāta-jāḍy = eva catur-ambudhi-majjanāt /
ātapāya dharānātha gatā mārtaṇḍa-maṇḍalam //

'Thy fame, Oh lord of the earth, which was, as it were, benumbed with cold through its bathing in the four oceans, went up to the sphere of the sun in order to warm itself.'

Another conception we find in Śambhu, the bard of king Harṣa of Kashmir (1089-1101 A. D.), in the *Rājendrakarṇapūra*, verse 67 (*Subhāṣitāvalī*, No. 2627)—

kāntāreṣu ca kānaneṣu ca sarit-tīreṣu ca kṣmābhṛtām =
utsaṅgeṣu ca pattaneṣu ca sarit-bhartus = taṭ-ānteṣu ca /
bhrāntāḥ ketaka-garbha-pallava-rucaḥ śrāntā iva kṣmāpate
kānte nandana-kandalī-parisare rohanti te kīrtayaḥ //

'Thy glory, Oh lord of the earth, which shines white like the inner sprouts of the *ketaka*, wandered about in forests and groves, on the banks of rivers, on the slopes of mountains, in cities and on the shores of the ocean; and then, as if exhausted [by this long journey], it sprouts up [as white flowers] on the lovely plots of plantain trees in the garden of gods.'

These modes of expression are quite complex and bombastic in comparison with Hariṣeṇa's simple and natural conception of the motive for the ascent of fame. No doubt, this is accounted for by the change in the

---

[7] See *Subhāṣitāvalī*, introduction, p. 4; and Prinsep, *Indian Antiquities*, Vol II, p. 247.

Indian taste, which was brought about in the long period that separated these three poets.

Not less familiar is the comparison of a king's glory with the Ganges, which flows through the three worlds and purifies them. Thus it is said in a verse of Kṛṣṇaka in the *Subhāṣitāvalī*, No. 2556[8]—

sā khyāt = āsti jagat-traye Suranadī sā Śambhu-cūḍāmaṇau
śeṣ = āśeṣa-tuṣāra-soma-suṣamā-caurī guṇair = nirmalaiḥ |
yuktā sā bhavadīya-kīrti-tulan-aucityaṁ bhajet = sā na ced =
bhūpāla kṣaṇadeśasantatam = adhoy = āneka-tānā bhavet ||

This would quite suffice to show that the ideas contained in the concluding part of the panegyric, according to the translation quoted above, are current in court poetry. This itself vouches for the correctness of the proposed interpretation and proves the fact that this part of Hariṣeṇa's composition has been written in the *kāvya* style.

To turn from this digression to the examination of the form of the panegyric, we must begin with remarking that Hariṣeṇa, like Vatsabhaṭṭi, tries to introduce too often a change of metre in his verses. Thus, of the verses partially preserved, three (3, 5 and 8) are composed in *Sragdharā*, two (4 and 7) in *Śārdūlavikrīḍita*, and one each in *Mandākrāntā* (6) and *Pṛthvī* (9). The bad caesura comes only once in the third *pāda* of the last verse. The language of the verses is, on the whole, simple, and especially the compounds of extraordinary length which are used by Vatsabhaṭṭi, are carefully avoided. With the prose part of the panegyric, however, things are quite otherwise. Here, simple words are only the exception, while very long compounds are the general rule, the longest compound word (lines 19-20) containing more than 120 syllables. There cannot be any doubt that this contrast is intentional. Because all the manuals of poetics are unanimous on the point that the essence of elevated prose to be used in romance and stories consists in the length of compounds; while the different schools are not so unanimous regarding the admissibility of long compounds in verses. Thus Daṇḍin says in the *Kāvyādarśa*, I. 80-81—

---

[8] Cf. also *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*, No. 1263.

> *Ojaḥ samāsa-bhūyastvam = etad = gadyasya jīvitam |*
> *padyeṣv = a-Dākṣiṇātyāṇām = idam = ekaṁ parāyaṇam ||*
> *tad = gurūṇāṁ laghūnāṁ ca bāhuly-ālpatva-miśraṇaiḥ |*
> *uccāvaca-prakāram tad = dṛśyam = ākhyāyik-ādiṣu ||*

81. 'The grandeur or strength [of language consists] in the frequency of compounds; it is the very life of [poetic] prose. Even in verses, it is regarded as the main feature by those who do not belong to the Southern School.'

82. 'It is of many kinds, according to the mixture of a larger or smaller number of the long or short syllables; and it is found in romances and other similar works.'

Daṇḍin's statement leaves no doubt about the fact that Hariṣeṇa follows the style of the Southerners, the so-called Vaidarbhī *rīti*, which must have enjoyed in the fourth century the same high esteem as in later times, when a large number of writers belonging to different parts of India advocate it as the most beautiful. Hariṣeṇa, however, could hardly have come from the south of India. His station at the court of Samudragupta shows that he lived in the north-east, in Pāṭaliputra,[9] and probably belonged to a family settled in the same place from of old.

Apart from the use of long compounds in the prose parts, there is nothing very artificial in Hariṣeṇa's language. Of the *śabdālaṁkāras*, he uses only the simplest kind of

---

[9] That Pāṭaliputra, and not Kanauj as is usually supposed, was the capital of the Guptas follows from the verses from Fleet's No. VI, translated above, wherein a minister of Candragupta II calls himself an inhabitant of Pāṭaliputra.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preseyation Foundation, Chandigarh

alliteration, the *Varṇānuprāsa*, and even this occurs principally in the prose parts[10] and that, too, not many times. Of the *arthālaṁkāras*, he uses *Rūpaka* very often, and *Upamā* and *Śleṣa* more rarely. Two instances where the last *alaṁkāra*, i. e., *Śleṣa*, occurs have been discussed above. A third instance of the same is met with in line 25, in the epithets of Samudragupta :

sādhv-asādh-ūdaya-pralaya-hetu-puruṣasy = ācintyasya

which is to be translated thus—'Of an incomprehensible prince who is the cause of the elevation of the good and of the destruction of the bad [and thus who resembles] the unfathomable spirit (Brahman) that is the cause of the origination and the destruction [of the world] which consists of both good and bad people.'[11] The poetic figure used here is *Śleṣa-mūlaṁ Rūpakam*, i. e., a metaphor which is brought about by the double meaning of the words used. The instance reminds us very much of the play on words found in Subandhu and Bāṇa. This is, however, the only instance of the kind in the whole of the *praśasti*, a circumstance which shows that Hariṣeṇa, like Kālidāsa and other adherents of the Vaidarbhī *rīti*, indeed, regarded *Śleṣa* as a poetic embellishment, but himself shunned the insipidly frequent use of the same. Hariṣeṇa, however, does not direct his attention so much to the use of the *alaṁkāras*, as to fine execution of the pictures of the several situations under description, and to the choice as well as the arrangement of words. Of the former, verse 4, the only verse that can be restored completely, is a typical example in point, which depicts the manner in which Samudragupta was ordained by his father to be his successor—

---

[10] For instance, line 17 : *paraśu-śara-śakti-prās-āsi-tomara* ; line 20 : *rāja-grahaṇa-mokṣ-ānugraha* ; line 26 : *vigrahavato lok-ānugrahasya,* and so on.

[11] [Samudragupta is here called the Inscrutable Being who is the cause of the prosperity of the pious and the destruction of the wicked, i.e. an incarnation of Viṣṇu.—D.C.S.]

4. ' "Here is a noble man,"[12] with these words, the father embraced him, with shivers of joy that spoke of his affection and looked at him, with eyes heavy with tears and overcome with love—the courtiers breathing freely with joy and the kinsmen of equal grade looking up with sad faces—and said to him : "Protect then this whole earth".'

It is not possible to have a more concise and a more graphic picture of the situation. There is not a word which is unnecessary and one believes as if he sees the scene with his own eyes, how the old Candragupta, in the presence of his sons each of whom hoped to have the highest fortune, and of his court household who were afraid lest the choice may fall on an unworthy person, turns round to his favourite son. This verse is one of the best productions the Indians have given us, in the domain of miniature portraits, which is their forte. This very example would also illustrate Hariṣeṇa's special care for the choice and arrangement of words, a qualification which can be easily seen even in other parts of the composition, both metrical and prose. In the prose part, there are inserted between the long compounds, at definite intervals, shorter phrases, in order to enable the reciter to draw his breath and the hearer to catch the sense. In the long compounds, the words are so chosen as to bring about a certain rhythm through the succession of short and long syllables ; and care is taken to see that this rhythm changes from time to time. This can be best seen by a representation of the design of the compounds occurring in lines 17-22, by marking the accents as is customary in recitation. The lines in question contain only seven long compounds, the arrangement of whose syllables is as follows—

---

[12] [Some scholars are inclined to read *ehy=eh=īti* for *āryo h=īti*.—D.C.S.]

1. Ú U U / Ú U U / U —́ U / Ú U U / — —́ U
2. Ú U U / Ú U / U —́ U / —́ U / —́ —
3. U —́ U / — —́ U /
4. Ú U U / Ú U / —́ U / —́ — / —́ —́ U / —́ U U / —́U—́U /
U —́ U / — —́ U —́ U —́ / U Ú U U / U —́ —́ U — /
Ú U / U —́ U / —́ — / U Ú U — Ú U U / —́ U U U /
—́ U —
5. —Ú U U / U —́ U / —́ — — —́ U — / —́ U —́ U /
— —́ U U / —́ U —́ U / —́ U Ú U U / U —́ U / Ú U /
— —́ U U / —́ U —́ — —́ U —́ U U / Ú U U / — — Ú U /
—́ U —́ — / U —́ U U / —́ U —́ U / — —́ U U /
—́ U —́ U / — —́ U —́ U —́ U / —́ U —́ U U / U —́ U /
—́ U U Ú U U / U —́ U U / Ú U U / —́ U / —́ U —́ U U /
—́ U / Ú U U / —́ — / —́ U U / Ú U — / U —́ — /
—́ U / U —́ — —́ U
6. —́ U —́ U / Ú U U / —́ U —́ U / —́ U —́ U / Ú U U U
—́ U / —́ U —́ —́ U U / —́ U Ú U —́ —́ U —́ —́ U /
—́ — / Ú U — / Ú U — —́ — / U —́ U / Ú U —
7. Ú U —́ U —́ U U / —́ — / Ú U U / — —́ U /

It is obvious that the short compounds marked 3 and 7 are to serve as resting points, and that the rhythm in 1, 2 and 4 is to remind us of the beginnings of the *Daṇḍakas*.

In Hariṣeṇa's poetical imagery, we come across many conceptions that are very familiarly met with in *kāvya* literature. Some of these have been already dwelt upon, while discussing the concluding part of his composition. We now notice a few others. The fragment of verse 3 says—

'The order of the Possessor of the true meaning of the *śāstras*[13] whose heart is highly happy at the association with the good,—multiplied as its power is, by the virtues of the wise—puts an end to the war between good poetry and prosperity and thus enjoys in the world of the learned, a far-extending sovereignty whose shining glory endures in many poems.'

Here we have the exceedingly favourite allegory of the fight or discord between the Muse and the Goddess of Wealth, which condemns the poet and the learned man to poverty and makes the rich incapable of service to Wisdom and Art. By way of comparison, I quote here from the classical literature only the *Bharatavākya* at the end of the *Vikramorvaśīya*, where Kālidāsa prays that this antagonism should cease—

paraspara-virodhinyor = eka-saṁśraya-durlabham |
saṅgataṁ Śrī-Sarasvatyor = bhūtaye = 'stu sadā satām ||

'May the union of the mutually hostile goddesses Śrī and Sarasvatī, which is to be found only rarely at one place, bring good luck to the good !'

Further, the author mentions in verse 8, which will be given yet more fully later on, amongst the high excellences of the king, *śaśikara-śucayaḥ kīrtayaḥ sapratānāḥ*, 'the fame sprouting forth, shining purely like the moon,' and thus bears evidence to his being aware of the well-known idea of the *kīrtivallī* or the creeper of fame, which covers the three worlds with its tendrils. With

---

[13] I.e. of Samudragupta.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preseyation Foundation, Chandigarh

this may be compared in the field of classical literature, *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*, No. 1235.

A third most favourite poetic respresentation of fame is met with in the second compound in line 23, referring to Samudragupta—'Whose fame arising from the re-establishment of many fallen kingdoms and of many extinguished royal races, is tired by its journey through the three worlds.' Hemacandra also in the *praśasti* to his grammar, verse 29, similarly speaks of the want of rest for his master's fame[14]—

yad-dor-maṇḍala-kuṇḍalīkṛta-dhanur-daṇḍena Siddhādhipa
krītaṃ vairi-kulāt = tvayā [pravi]dalat-kund-āvadātaṁ yaśaḥ /
bhrāntvā trīṇi jaganti kheda-vivaśaṁ tan = Mālavīnāṁ vyadhād =
āpāṇḍau stana-maṇḍale ca dhavale gaṇḍa-sthale = 'vasthitim //

'With the bow bent into a circular form by your arm stretched round, you won, Oh king Siddha, your fame that shines in white like the blooming flower of the jasmine; being rendered helpless through the exhaustion of wandering through the three worlds, that your fame has at last rested itself on the palid, round breasts and the white cheeks of the Mālava women.'

In line 25, again, we have quite an original conception which is meant to illustrate how far Samudragupta's glory obscured that of all his rivals. The poet there praises Samudragupta as a ruler 'who, in consequence of the overflow of his many virtues elevated through hundreds of good works, wiped off with his feet the fame of other kings.'

The idea seems to be that the leaves on which the fame of other kings is written, lie before Samudragupta. The flow of his virtues streams over them, and he is only required to stir his foot, to obliterate the praises of the rulers of antiquity. I cannot point out anything in literature, which exactly corresponds to this. Nevertheless, it cannot escape the attention of any one that the conception quite fits in with the character of the style of court poets.

---

[14] Cf. also the verse quoted above from the *Rājendrakarṇapūra*.

In the next line (26), we meet with a comparison which occurs frequently in the epics and is used in later times by almost every Classical poet and in every *praśasti*—where Samudragupta is celebrated as a king 'who resembles Dhanada, Varuṇa, Indra and Antaka (i.e., the guardian-gods of the four directions)'. Equally favourite is the immediately following *Upamā* : 'who puts to shame the preceptor of gods by his sharp and subtle understanding, and Tumburu, Nārada and others by his lovely performances of music'. About the comparison of the king with Bṛhaspati, we have spoken above. As for the statement that Samudragupta was a better musician than the well-known *Gandharva* and the sage of gods who invented the *vīṇā*, an explanation is furnished by the coins, as Fleet has pertinently remarked, on which Samudragupta is represented as a lute-player. For the last climax of hyperbolical representation, we also meet with analogies in the *kāvyas*. When Hariṣeṇa says in lines 27-28, that his master is 'a god dwelling in this world, whose many marvellous and noble deeds deserve to be praised for a very long time and who is a man only in that he performs acts necessary according to worldly conventions', we are reminded, in the first place, of Bāṇa's description of his patron, Harṣa (*Harṣacarita*, pp. 207-08), where his deeds have been put on a level with those of Indra, Prajāpati, Viṣṇu and Śiva, and he himself has been identified with these gods. A still more important parallel is provided by the statements of the Prakrit poet, Vākpati, about Yaśovarman of Kanauj (*Gaüḍavaho*, verses 167-81), according to which, the king is an incarnation of Bālaka-Hari or Viṣṇu. As is to be expected of a poet of the eighth century, Vākpati expresses the idea with a greater elaboration of details.[15]

Many more points of relationship with the *kāvya* literature can be discovered in the individual expressions of our *praśasti*. It would suffice if I only point to *upaguhya* (for *āśliṣya*); *bhāva-piśuna*, *mlān-ānana*, *sneha-vyāluḷita*, *bāṣpa-guru* (all in verse 4), *adbhut-odbhinna-harṣa* (verse 5), *uccāpakāra*, *toṣ-ottuṅga*, *sneha-phulla*, and the frequent use of *sphuṭa*. The parallel passages given in both the Petersburg lexicons spare me the trouble of giving here many new quotations. Whoever is familiar with the diction of the *kāvyas* will not require any special proof, but will at once recognise the affinity of these and other modes of expression to those used by Classical poets.

Now, we have to notice a number of cases, especially in the prose part, where Hariṣeṇa obviously tried to surpass his rivals in the composition of *praśastis*. To this category belong most of the long compounds in lines 17-24, in which the closing part especially comes now and then as a surprise and deviates very much from the usual track. Thus, in line 21, for instance, instead of saying that Samudragupta had acquired great power through the forcible extinction of many kings of Āryāvarta, Hariṣeṇa represents his master as a prince 'who was great through his power which expanded itself through the forcible extinction of many kings of the land of the Āryas'. Perhaps, the simple and natural expression *raṇa-labdha-mahāprabhāvasya* appeared too trivial to the poet, and for that reason, he went in for the more artificial one *raṇ-oddhṛta-prabhāva-mahataḥ*. So also the last parts of the following compound phrases are unusual and deliberately sought—

---

[15] The deification of the king is already found in old times; e.g., in the *Mānavadharmaśāstra*, VII. 4-9.

1. (lines 22-23) — 'whose fierce sovereignty [the neighbouring kings] propitiated by means of the payment of all the taxes [levied], the carrying out of his orders, salutations and visits' ; 2. (lines 25)—'the mighty bravery of his arm which held the whole earth in bondage, received homage from the inhabitants of all countries in various ways, such as causing themselves to be presented to him, offering daughters and other presents, and requesting him for a decree with the Garuḍa seal for the possession of their country' ; 3. (lines 26)—'whose heart had willingly received the formula and the consecration for the deliverance of the poor, the miserable, the helpless and the sick'. Whoever will take the trouble of reading through other published *praśastis*, will easily see the originality of these modes of expression and judge them according to their worth. The fact, however, that Hariṣeṇa makes use of deliberately sought modes of expression is to be explained by the existence of many other similar panegyrics whose simple and unadorned diction he tried to surpass.

The clearest proof, however, for the fact that Hariṣeṇa's composition does not at all belong to the beginning of the *kāvya* period is provided by those passages in which he speaks of the king's peculiar poetic activity. In this connection, we should refer above all to what we have of the eighth verse, wherein the poet declares—

'He alone is worthy of the thoughts of the learned. Because what excellence is there, which would not be his ? He has made firm the barrier of law, his is the sprouting fame that shines purely like the rays of the moon, his is the wisdom which pierces down to the truth, his is the self-control........, his is the poetic style which is worthy of study, and his are the poetic works which multiply the spiritual treasures of poets.'

In the second part of his composition, Hariṣeṇa again refers to the last point when he says in line 27 that

Samudragupta's 'title as the Prince of Poets was well established by the composition of many poems worthy of the imitation of the learned'. If one adds to this, verse 3 spoken of above and the expressions used by Hariṣeṇa about his person, it naturally follows that, during the reign of Samudragupta, the *kāvya* literature was in full bloom, and that the conditions at his court were absolutely similar to those which are reported to have prevailed in later times at the courts of Kanauj, Kashmir, Ujjain, Dhārā and Kalyāṇī, and which are found to exist even to this day, here and there in India. The cultivators of Sanskrit poetry, who were called by the names of *kavi* or *budha* or *vidvas*, were not born or self-taught poets, but were professional learned men or Paṇḍits who studied the *śāstras*, i. e. at the least, *Vyākaraṇa*, *Koṣa*, *Alaṁkāra* and *Chandas*, and who wrote according to the hard and fast rules of poetics, as is shown by the form of Hariṣeṇa's little composition. The Sanskrit *kāvya*, which owed its origin to court-patronage, and which could exist only by means of the same, was assiduously cultivated at the courts. The king supported and raised to honour such poets, and even he himself, and with him his high officers too, emulated with their protégés. Perhaps he had even a *kavirāja*, or a poet-laureate, appointed. At any rate, the title, as such, was in use in the days of Samudragupta, the title which in later times occurs very often in Sanskrit literature, and which even at present, is given away by Indian princes, associated as it is with many benefits. His court could not thus have been the only one which patronized the exertions of the Paṇḍits in the domain of poetry.

IV

Girnar Inscription of the Reign of Mahākṣatrapa Rudradāman

The results, obtained from the examination of Hariṣeṇa's *praśasti*, point to the provisional supposition that the *kāvya* literature was in bloom, at least in the whole of the fourth century, and the works, composed at that time, do not essentially differ from the samples of Vaidarbhī *rīti* preserved for us. Beyond this, we cannot go with the help of the Gupta inscriptions known to us up to this time. It, therefore, becomes necessary to consider the only great Sanskrit inscription, which can, with certainty, be placed in a considerably earlier age. It is Rudradāman's inscription on the well-known rock on the way from Junāgaṛh-Girinagara to the present Girnār, a holy mountain known as Urjayat or Ujjayanta in earlier times. This inscription would be more properly called 'the *praśasti* of the restoration of the Sudarśana lake, during the reign of *Mahākṣatrapa* Rudradāman.' Its age is pretty certainly fixed, in the first place, by the name of the king and *Kṣatrapa** Caṣṭana, who is spoken of as Rudradāman's grandfather, and in the second place, by the date of the storm which shattered down the embankment of the Sudarśana lake. Caṣṭana is no doubt rightly identified with king Tiastanes who, as Ptolemy informs us, ruled in Ozéné or Ujjayinī. The Greek name quite corresponds with the Indian name, not merely on the ground of other similar cases which occur and in which the Indian palatal sounds are represented by the Greek dentals with *ia* following,[1] but because even the Indian pronunciation of the palatals varies between *tśa* and *tya* as well as between *dza* and *dya*, and we frequently hear of

---

* [*Mahākṣatrapa.*—D.C.S.]

[1] Cf. Ṭiatouṛa=Citoḍa and Dịamouṇa=Jamuṇā (Yamunā).

tya and *dya* as combinations with the sibilants.[2] The possibility that Ptolemy could have meant any other Caṣṭana than that of our inscription must be regarded as out of question, because the name occurs in no other dynasty, and even amongst the Western Kṣatrapas, it is only the grandfather of Rudradāman, who is so named. Thus, if we accept this identification of names and persons, it follows that Caṣṭana must have reigned before 150 A.D. and further that his grandson Rudradāman can, in no case, be placed later than in the first half of the third century, probably even earlier. The settling of the date becomes even more accurate through the fact that the fixing of the beginning of the Gupta era in the year 318 or 319 makes quite probable the view already maintained by Bhagvānlāl, Bhāū Dājī, Bhaṇḍārkar and others, according to which the date of the inscription in question, i.e. the year 72, refers to the Śaka era and thus corresponds to our year 151 A.D. This date is the first of a long series, which continues down to the year 310. Inscriptions[3] provide the following dates—103 for Rudradāman's son Rudrasiṁha, 127 for Rudrasiṁha's son Rudrasena, and 252 for *Svāmī* Rudrasena, while on the numerous coins are frequently represented almost all the decades between 100 and 310. During this long period, the successors of Caṣṭana appear to have maintained their sovereignty over Western India, except for a short interruption and to have been in possession of Mālwā as well as the neighbouring provinces of Gujarāt and Kāṭhiāwāṛ. There is nothing in the inscriptions before us, that would admit the conclusion that their capital was ever removed from Ujjain further westwards. On the other hand, our inscription shows quite clearly that the residence of the prince lay outside of Gujarāt and Kāṭhiāwāṛ, as his officer Suviśākha, according to line 18, was governor of Ānarta[4] and Surāṣṭra. The successors of the Kṣatrapas, in the sovereignty over Mālwā and the whole of Western India, were the Guptas, whose conquest of the former province falls before or in the Gupta year 82, i.e. 400-01 or 401-02 A.D., as is shown by Fleet's No. 3. Accordingly, it is to be expected that the last date of the Kṣatrapas coming from Caṣṭana's race cannot lie far removed from the Gupta year 82. And this is actually the case, if the year 310 on the Kṣatrapa coins is interpreted as a year of the Śaka era. Then it corresponds to the year 388 or 389 A.D., and is removed only by eleven years from the year in which the conquest of Mālwā could have taken place at the latest. Though this very consideration is enough to commend the identification of the era, used by the Kṣatrapas, with that of the Śaka kings, there are still many other reasons of no less importance, which would confirm the same. The titles of Caṣṭana are *Rājan*, *Kṣatrapa* or *Mahākṣatrapa*, and *Svāmin*. The word *Kṣatrapa* is no doubt, as was long ago asserted, an adaptation of the Persian *Kshatrapa*,[5] 'Satrap'.

---

[2] See the remarks on the reverse of the table of letters in my *Guide to the Elementary Course of Sanskrit*. I shall, in another place, furnish proof that the modern pronunciation of the Indian palatals is very old.

[3] The three dated inscriptions are—that on the rock of Gunda (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. X, p. 157), that on the pillar of Jasdan (*Journ. Bomb. Br. Roy. As. Soc.*, Vol. VIII, pp. 234 ff.), in which, according to an impression of Dhruva's, the date is to be read as [*tri*]*yuttaraśate* 100(+) 3, and one unpublished inscription on a pillar in Okhāmaṇḍal, of which I possess a sketch and a photograph. The view that the era used by the Western Kṣatrapas is the Śaka era, is found at first in *Journ. Bomb. Br. Roy. As. Soc.*, Vol. VIII, pp. 243 ff., and is further developed in Bhaṇḍārkar's *Early History of the Dekkan*, pp. 19 ff. See also *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.*, N.S., 1890, pp. 639 ff. I opposed the same in *Arch. Surv. West. Ind.*, Vol. V, p. 73, when I believed that the beginning of the Gupta era fell in the second century A.D.

---

[4] Ānarta included Northern Kāṭhiāwāṛ and Northern Gujarāt up to the Mahī.

[5] [Old Persian *Khshathrapāvan*.—D.C.S.]

Because, although we can look upon the term as a pure Sanskrit word and translate it as 'the protector of Kṣatriyas', still such a title is entirely unknown to Sanskrit literature. *Kṣatrapa* and its Prakrit substitute *chatrapa* or *khatrapa* occur, in the first place, in the coins and inscriptions of barbarous kings and their governors, who ruled over North-Western India.[6] Even Caṣṭana as well as his father, the *Mahākṣatrapa* Ysamotika,[7] were foreigners, and there is no reason why we should believe that the title was fixed upon them in a different sense. If Caṣṭana bears the title of *Rājan* also, well, it might have been conferred upon him only as a mark of distinction for some special service. In a similar manner, the vassals styled *Sāmanta* or *Mahāsāmanta* as well as other high dignitaries received the title *Mahārāja*[8] in the fifth, sixth and later centuries. Caṣṭana's suzerain could have been just one of the Indo-Scythian kings whose might had overshadowed the whole of North-Western and Western India, towards the close of the first century and in the second century, as is shown by the inscriptions and the accounts of the Greeks : and a still clearer proof of his connection with the North-West is provided by his coins, wherein his name is given in the Bactro-Pali or rather Kharoṣṭrī[9] alphabet which is written from right to left. It is very probable that the descendants and immediate successors of Caṣṭana bore the same relation to the rulers of the Indo-Scythian kingdom as long as it was in existence. As for Rudradāman, in particular, I see a clear confession of his dependence in the expression (line 15) *svayam-adhigata-Mahākṣatrapa-śabdena,*[10] 'by [Rudradāman] who had himself won the title *Mahākṣatrapa*'. According to my view,[11] the author means to say that Rudradāman did not inherit the title *Mahākṣatrapa* from his father or grandfather (although they possessed it), but that he had to win it by means of his special services and that he received it from his suzerain. To this interpretation, I am specially led by the meaning of the very analogous phrase, *samadhigatapañca-mahāśabda*, 'he who has won the five *mahāśabdas* (i.e., either five great titles, or the right to have the royal music-band to play)', which is used in a very large number of inscriptions of *Sāmantas* or vassal chiefs. Moreover, even supposing that Rudradāman had made himself independent and had himself taken a title, it appears to me improbable that he should have chosen the title *Mahākṣatrapa.* In that case, he would have certainly named himself *Mahārāja*, *Rājarāja*, *Rājātirāja*, or *Rājādhirāja*, as the independent kings of the first and second centuries always did. Thus Caṣṭana, in all probability was a dependent of some Indo-Scythian king, and it is, therefore, not possible that he should have founded a new era. He must have used the era of his suzerain, and the same must be supposed in connection with his grandson. If then, as I believe it must be assumed, this latter also bore the same relation to the Indo-Scythians, there can be no doubt regarding the interpretation of the date of the Girnār *praśasti.*

---

[6] Notice specially the copper-plate on which *Chatrapa* Liaka Kusuluka appears by the side of the king Moga. In this case, it is quite clear that Liaka was the Satrap of Moga.

[7] See *Journ. Bomb. Br. Roy. As. Soc.*, Vol. VIII, p. 3. A very nicely preserved coin on which this name is very clearly readable, was shown to me, some years ago, by Burgess. Bhagvānlāl reads the name as Ghsamotika. [Ghsāmotika was never a *Mahākṣatrapa.*—D.C.S.]

[8] See Fleet, *Corp. Inscr. Ind.*, Vol. III, p. 15, note.

[9] See Terrien de la Conperie, *Babylonian Record*, Vol. I, p. 60. Bhagvānlāl (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VIII, p. 258) has rightly recognized the historical significance of the use of this alphabet on Caṣṭana's coins.

According to this calculation, then, the destruction of the Sudarśana lake by the storm mentioned in our inscription falls in the year 150 or 151 A.D. The inscription itself, however, must have been written yet later, sometime towards the end of the first century of the Śaka era, i.e. between 160 and 170 A.D., because it is said in lines 17-18 that the restoration of the dam was attended with great difficulties. Thus it is most conclusively proved that even during the second half of the second century, there was in existence a *kāvya* literature. Although a colophon which might have given us the exact character of the composition is wanting, still it can be easily seen that it contains a *gadya-kāvya* as such. Its style is similar to that of the prose part of Hariṣeṇa's *kāvya* in many respects and, besides the use of *alaṅkāras*, there is an obvious effort on the part of the poet, to satisfy all the requirements prescribed for prose composition by poetics. At the same time, however, it cannot be denied that its worth is very considerably less than that of the Allahābād *praśasti*, and that its author did not by far possess the imagination and talent of Hariṣeṇa. The language itself which is, indeed, generally speaking, flowing and good shows several deviations from the usage of Classical poets and even presents some actual mistakes. Thus in *...no ā garbhāt* (line 9) there is a wrong *sandhi* made. Among other offences against the rules of orthography prescribed by grammar are the frequent omission of *c* before *ch* and the use of the *anusvāra* for *ñ* and *n* in the body of words, as well as for *m* at the end,[12] though both these, it is true, are sanctioned by usage. Further, there is seen the influence of Prakrit in the word *vīśaduttarāṇi* (line 7) which stands for *viṁśad-uttarāṇi*. Even the form *viṁśat* used only on the analogy of *triṁśat*, etc., is not Classical, but belongs to the language of the epics and the Purāṇas as is shown by the quotations in the Petersburg Lexicon. If the long syllables in *nirvyājam = avajīty = āvajītya* which are against rule, are not mere mistake in writing of the stone-engraver, —although in the case of *rāgena* for *rāgeṇa* no other assumption is possible,—then they must be regarded as only instances of Prakrit influence. Because the Prakrit dialects frequently represent *niḥ* by *nī* or *ṇī*, and the Gujarātī *jīt*, 'conquest', and *jītavuṁ*, 'to conquer', agree with the long syllable in *avajītya*. So also, the instrumental *patinā* in line 11 is formed against Pāṇini's rules, though it is in agreement with the usage of the Vedic and epic language. There is also a mistake of syntax in *anyatra saṅgrāmeṣu* (line 10), 'except in battles', which ought to be *anyatra saṅgrāmebhyaḥ*. So also the form *pryatyākhyāt-āraṁbhaṁ* (line 17) would be a worse mistake of syntax, as I believe in all probability it cannot be regarded as an error in writing for *pratyākhyāt-ārambhe*. Last of all, the phrase *parjanyena ekārṇava-bhūtāyām = iva pṛthivyāṁ kṛtāyām* (line 5) is a hard nut to crack. No full-fledged Classical poet has taken the liberty in this way. On the other hand, a similar phrase is more frequently met with in the epics.[13] The many points of similarity with the epics, which the language of the Girnār *praśasti* exhibits, could have led to the supposition that the author had cultivated himself exclusively by the reading of epics and that a *kāvya* proper was not at all known to him. But such a supposition is contradicted, first of all, by the general impression, which his composition makes. Whoever reads it attentively would feel that, in the matter of development of the style, it shows a stage considerably in advance of the epics. Further the supposition is contradicted by several particulars leading to a similar conclusion, especially the important passage in line 14, wherein the author enumerates the attributes of a good composition, prevalent in his time.

---

[10] [Read *nāmnā* for *śabdena.*—D.C.S.]

[11] Bhagvānlāl thinks otherwise. According to him, the idea is that Rudradāman freed himself from the yoke of a suzerain.

---

[12] The frequent avoidance of a *sandhi* is not incorrect, because, according to a well-known *Kārikā*, the *sandhi* depends upon *vivakṣā*, i.e., it is to be made only if the words actually belong together. In the prose inscriptions, *sandhi* is usually not made where we would have a comma or a semi-colon.

---

[13] Cf. for instance, *Nala*, XII. 28—*ketubhūtam=iv=otthitam*, under *bhūta* in the Petersburg Lexicon.

As for the points of affinity with the *kāvya* style proper, which this *praśasti* exhibits, it is to be first of all noticed that the author knew very well the canons laid down by Daṇḍin as common to all schools, according to which *ojas* or *samāsa-bhūyastva*, the frequency and length of compounds, is the principal feature of a prose composition. In the *praśasti* also, the compounds occur more frequently than single words, and the compounds themselves often exhibit a conspicuous length. Thus in the very first line, there is a broken compound which consists of nine words with twentythree letters. Such compounds and others extending over between ten and twenty letters are numerous. Once in the description of the king (line 11) the author goes to the extreme of having a compound word which comprises seventeen words with forty letters. As compared with Hariṣeṇa's performance, that of the Gujarātī author is by all means a modest one, though the latter far surpasses what the epic poets have been capable of doing or have regarded as permissible. As with Hariṣeṇa, a rhythmical arrangement of letters in the longer compounds is often noticeable, as for instance, in lines 6 and 9 ff. Hand in hand with the length and number of compounds, goes the length of the sentences. The *praśasti* apparently contains only five sentences with forty-nine *grantha*, of which the fourth sentence alone consists of more than twenty-three *grantha*. Hariṣeṇa surpasses the Gujarātī writer in this point also, and this is an important point, because his whole *kāvya*, though longer in extent, contains only one sentence. Of the *Śabdālankāras*, we have only the *Anuprāsa*, and the repetitions of parts of words, more seldom of whole words, as well as of single letters producing a similar sound, are very frequently met with. The specially remarkable instances are—

gurubhir=abhyasta-nāmno Rudradāmno (line 4), *sṛṣta-vṛṣṭinā* (line 5), °*prabhṛtīnāṁ nadīnāṁ* (line 6), °*praharaṇa-vitaraṇa*° (line 10), °*prakṛtīnāṁ*° *Niṣād-ādīnām* (line 11), ° *kāma-viṣayāṇāṁ viṣayāṇāṁ* (*loc. cit.*), °*vidheyānāṁ Yaudheyānāṁ* (line 12), °*hast-occhray-ārjit-orjita*° (line 13), *nyāy-ādyānāṁ vidyānāṁ* (*loc. cit.*), *pāraṇa-dhāraṇa* (*loc. cit.*), *dāna-mān-āvamāna* (*loc. cit.*), *gadya-padya* (line 14), *pramāṇa-mān-onmān-o*° (*loc. cit.*), °*nāmnā* °*dāmnā* °*Rudradāmnā* (line 15), *paura-jānapadaṁ janaṁ* (line 16), *paura-jānapada-jan-ā*° (line 18), *āryeṇ=āhāryeṇa* (line 19).

The *Varṇ-ānuprāsas*, which do not strike us at first sight, but which are, nevertheless, not less characteristic, are specially numerous in *giri-śikhara-taru-taṭ-āṭṭālak-opatalpa-dvāra-śaraṇ-occhraya-vidhvaṁsinā* (line 6), where the repetitions of consonants and vowels are linked together very skilfully. Thus it is quite evident that the author took great troubles with these word-ornaments and attached great importance to them. His use of these far surpasses what the epic lilerature can present, and stands pretty on a level with what we have in Hariṣeṇa. The word *yathārtha-hast-occhray-ārjit-orjita-dharm-ānurāgeṇa* (lines 12-13) is just exactly in the *kāvya* style, for the compound *arjit-orjita* is very much favoured by the later court poets. As for the *Arth-ālaṅkāras*, our author uses them but very rarely. Thus there are only two *Upamās* to be noted. In line 1-2, it is said that the lake or rather the embankment thereof is *parvvata-pratisparddhi*,[14] 'resembling the spur of a mountain', and, in line 8, the dried-up lake is spoken of as *maru-dhanva-kalpam*, 'resembling a sandy desert.' In the former instance, the expression *pratisparddhi* is quite characteristic of the *kāvya* style. We have an *Utprekṣā* in the already mentioned passage, *parjanyena*

---

[14] [*Parvata-pāda-pratispardhi* (lines 1-2).—D.C.S.]

ekārṇava-bhūtāyām = iva pṛthivyāṁ kṛtāyām and a faint attempt at *Śleṣa* in line 8, where it is said that the lake had become *atibhṛśaṁ durdda[rśanam]*. For the rest, the author neglects the numerous opportunities which are offered to him, for instance, in the description of effect of a representation of facts marked with strong outlines, than on the conglomeration of more or less conventional figures of sense. It must be conceded that he succeeds quite well in individual descriptions, though he fails in the fineness of execution and the elaboration of details, which are found to be present in Hariṣeṇa. The passage in lines 3-7 describing the destruction of the lake, reads best notwithstanding many important lacunae. Freely rendered, the passage would read thus—

'In the year seventy-two 72 [in the reign] of the king and Great Satrap Rudradāman whose name is uttered by the worthy [praying for purity]—the son [of the king, and Great Satrap,* Lord Jayadāman] . …… the grandson of the king and Great Satrap, Lord Caṣṭana—the mention of whose name brings purity—on the [fifth or fifteenth][15] day of the dark half of the month Mārgaśirṣa………a storm with great streaming showers, as it were, reduced the earth to one single ocean , the terribly augmented force of the Suvarṇasikatā, the Palasinī and other rivers of the mountain Urjayat broke through the dam…… although proper remedial measures were taken, the water agitated by the whirlwind which [raged] with fearful violence as if at the end of the world-age, and which shattered down mountain-peaks, trees, rocks, terraces, temple-turrets, gates, abodes and triumphal columns, the water scattered about and tore to pieces [the………and] this [lake] [crammed] with stones, trees, bushes and circles of creepers that were thrown down, was broken up down to the bottom of the stream.'

---

* [Jayadāman was a Satrap and not a 'Great Satrap'.—D.C.S.]

[15] [First.—D.C.S.]

The small number of *Arth-ālaṅkāras* is richly counterbalanced by the fourth word in line 14, which praises in all probability Rudradāman's skill in poesy, and contains, without question, the views of the author regarding the requirements of a good composition. Unfortunately, the word is mutilated. After *sphuṭa-laghu-madhura-citra kānta-śabda-samay-odār-ālaṅkṛta-gadya-padya* eight letters have been obliterated, followed by *na*. The last letter shows that the expression ended with the instrumental of an *a*-stem. Immediately after *gadya-padya* only the word *kāvya* can come, as it is absolutely necessary to complete the two expressions *gadya* and *padya*. The remaining six letters should then have been a phrase like *vidhāna-pravīṇe*, *racana-kuśale*, *racana-nirate* or like [*ā*]*svādana-nirate*. Now if we consider what is said of Rudradāman in line 13, viz., that he had acquired greater renown by the complete study, the preservation, the thorough understanding, and the skill in the use, of the great lores, such as grammar, politics, music and logic, we must go in for one of the first series of expressions proposed. Because, the practising of classical poetry is the natural complement of the cultivation of the abstruse *śāstras* in the case of the Paṇḍit, and both these have been very frequently extolled as the qualifications of Indian kings. These considerations make it quite probable that the compound in question, when completed, should stand as *sphuṭa-laghu-madhura - citra - kānta - śabda - samayo-dār -ālaṅkṛta-gadya-padya-*[*kāvya-vidhāna-pravīṇe*]*ṇa*. Now, if we take the author on his word, and suppose that he is stating only facts, nothing more nor less, then it would follow that Rudradāman must have devoted himself to the cultivation of court poetry like Samudragupta and Harṣavardhana. Then the passage in question would further prove that the *kāvya* literature, in the second century, had been developed to such an extent that even the grandson of a foreign Satrap like Caṣṭana could not escape its influence. On the other hand, if it is thought more advisable to understand the expressions of praise in the *praśasti*, with a qualification, and to think that these expressions, regardless of actual facts, only concern themselves with representing Rudradāman as an ideal Indian prince—as the poet's fancy was pleased to depict, even then we would be justified in drawing this conclusion, at least, that during the second century it was the custom at Indian courts to occupy oneself with *kāvya*. Even this result in itself is of no little significance inasmuch as it proves that the invasion of the Scythians and other foreign races had extinguished the national art as little as the sciences. Further as regards the characteristics which the *praśasti* prescribes for *gadya-padya*, 'the compositions in prose and metrical form', it is to be noted that they essentially agree with those which are given by Daṇḍin for the Vaidarbhī *rīti*, in accordance with an old tradition.[16] In the *Kāvyādarśa*, I. 41-42, we have—

Śleṣaḥ prasādaḥ samatā mādhuryaṁ sukumāratā |
arthavyaktir = udāratvam = ojaḥ-kānti-samādhayaḥ ||
iti Vaidarbha-mārgasya prāṇā daśa guṇāḥ smṛtāḥ ||

Of these ten fundamental attributes of the Vaidarbhī style, the *praśasti* names three, viz., *mādhurya*, *kānti* and *udāratva*, and there is no reason why the *madhura* and *kānta* of the inscription should be interpreted otherwise than as *rasavat*, 'full of sentiment', and *sarva-jagat-kānta*, 'pleasing to the whole world' or 'lovely', respectively. On the other hand, the word *udāra*, 'elevated, grand', can scarcely have the meaning which Daṇḍin attributes to it, in the *Kāvyādarśa*, I. 76.[17] The preceding *śabda-samaya* specially enters into compound with *udāra* at any rate, and the expression *śabda-samay-odāra* cannot but be translated as 'grand through the conventional (i.e. with the poets) use of words'.[18] Accordingly, our author, following those who are referred to by Daṇḍin, as *kecit* (*Kāvy.*, I. 79), means by *udāra*, that the language in which are used proverbial words and attributes commended by poets, e.g., *krīḍā-saraḥ*, *līl-āmbuja* and similar words. A fourth characteristic mentioned by Daṇḍin, the *arthavyakti*, 'clearness of meaning', can be easily recognised in the synonymous expression *sphuṭa* of the inscription. A fifth characteristic *ojas*, 'the force of expression', may probably be meant by the adjective *citra*, 'wonderful, exciting wonder.' In favour of this, we can quote Bharata's definition (Chap. XVI)—

---

[16] The same are mentioned in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*, Ch. XVI—
śleṣaḥ prasādaḥ samatā samādhir=
mādhuryam=ojaḥ pada-saukumāryam |
arthasya ca vyaktir=udāratā ca
kāntiś=ca kāvyasya guṇā daś=aite ||

samāsavadbhir = vividhair = vicitraiś = ca padair = yutam |
sātu(dhu)-svarair = udāraiś = ca tad = ojaḥ parikīrtyate ||

Even in the epithet *laghu* which is wrongly rendered by the translators as 'short', we may find hidden a reference to the sixth attribute of the Vaidarbha style. *Laghu* here, no doubt, means 'beautiful, pleasing', and it very possibly stands for *prasāda* or *sukumāratā*, both of which are conducive to loveliness of composition. The last adjective, *alaṅkṛta*, leaves no doubt about the fact that the author of the

---

[17] *Utkarṣavān guṇaḥ kaścid=yasminn=ukte pratīyate |*
tad=udār-āhvayaṁ............|

[18] Bhagvānlāl's translation, 'remarkable for grammatical correctness', is not right for several reasons. 'Grammatical correctness' would be *śabda-śuddhatva*, and this quality does not make a composition *udāra*. Besides, the king's ability to write correctly is mentioned in line 13. I explain *śabda-samay-odāra* thus : *śabdeṣu śabda-viṣaye yaḥ kavīnāṁ samayaḥ saṅketa ācāro vā tena udāram.*

praśasti was acquainted with some theory of the *Alaṅkāras.* In accordance with the proposed filling up of the lacunae and the explanations offered so far, the whole clause may be thus rendered—

'[by the king and Great Satrap Rudradāman] who [was expert in the composition of] prose and metrical *kāvyas*, which are easily intelligible, charming, full of sentiment, capable of awakening wonder, lovely, noble with the conventional use of words, embellished [with the prescribed figures of speech].' Thus, whatever we may say about Rudradāman busying himself with poesy—a fact which is very probable, though of course we cannot be absolutely sure about it—so much is certain that the author of our *praśasti* lays on poets conditions very similar to those prescribed by Daṇḍin, that in the second century there must have been already in existence romances and other works in high prose as well as compositions not preserved to us, and that there also existed an *Alaṅkāra-śāstra.*

V

Nāsik Inscription No. 18, dated in the Nineteenth Regnal Year of Śrī-Puḷumāyi

A further contribution to the knowledge of the *kāvya* style of the second century and especially of the poetic ideas and comparisons in vogue at the time is made by the *praśasti* of a cave which was given over to the monks of the Bhadrāyanīya school in the nineteenth year of the reign of the Andhra king Śrī-Puḷumāyi. The date of the inscription can be only approximately determined at present. Nevertheless it must be somewhat older than the Girnār *praśasti* discussed above. Śrī-Puḷumāyi, like Caṣṭana, is, as we know, mentioned by Ptolemy, under the name of Siro-Polemaios or Siri-Polemios, as the ruler of Baithana, i.e., Paiṭṭhāna or

Pratiṣṭhāna on the Godāvarī river. Accordingly, the inscription in question will have to be placed somewhere about the middle of the second century. To the same result leads another circumstance which is put forth by Bhāū Dājī in *Journ. Bomb. Roy. As. Soc.*, Vol. VIII, p. 242. According to line 6 of our inscription, Puḷumāyi's father Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi extinguished the family of Khakharāta. In the inscriptions at Nāsik,[1] Junnar and Karle is mentioned a Kṣaharāta king and Satrap or Great Satrap Nahapāna, whose son-in-law, the Śaka Uṣavadāta or Usabhadāta was a great patron of the Brāhmaṇas and Buddhists and made many grants in the Western Deccan as well as in the Konkaṇ and Kaṭhiāwāṛ, and we are provided with several dates of his reign, from the year 40 to 46. The similarity of the names Khakharāta and Kṣaharāta makes it very probable that they denote one and the same person, a supposition which is also favoured by the circumstance that just the very districts, in which Uṣavadāta made his grants, have been mentioned in lines 2f. of our inscription as parts of Śātakarṇi's dominions.[2] The title Satrap or Great Satrap borne by Nahapāna leads to the further conclusion that he was a dependent prince and the fact that, on his coins, the Kharoṣṭrī-lipi is used side by side with the southern alphabet, proves his connection with the north-west where the Indo-Scythians were rulers. We may, therefore, suppose that he, like Rudradāman, used the Śaka era, and thus his last date, Saṁvat 46, would correspond to 124-25 A.D. Very probably his unfortunate war with Śātakarṇi took place soon after this year. According to his inscriptions,[3] Śātakarṇi ruled for at least 24 years, and extinguished the Kṣaharāta king and Satrap before the eighteenth year of his reign. For, the Nāsik inscription No. 13, bearing this year, disposes of a village in the district of Govardhana,[4] which had in earlier times belonged to the dominions of Nahapāna. If then we assume that the battle between Nahapāna and Śātakarṇi took place in the year 47 of the Śaka era used by the former, i.e., in 125-26 A.D., and in the fifteenth year of the reign of the latter, then the year of the writing of our inscription would be 153-54 A. D., by adding the 9 years of Śātakarṇi and the 19 years of Puḷumāyi to 125. Of course, it is possible that the date in question may be from ten to twelve years earlier or very few years later even. A later date than this does not seem to be probable, because the mention of Puḷumāyi's name by Ptolemy shows that he must have been on the throne a long time before 151 A.D., the date of the completion of the Geography.[5]

---

[1] *Archaeological Survey of Western India*, Vol. IV, pp. 99-103 (Nos. 5-11).

[2] See especially Inscription No. 20, in which a village given as a present by Usabhadāta is again given away by an Andhra king. Cf. *Arch. Sur. W. Ind.*, Vol. IV, p. 106 (No. 6) and pp. 112-113 (No. 120).

If we accept these conjectures which at least possess a very high probability, then our inscription is about twenty years older than the *praśasti* of the Sudarśana lake; and its style must be regarded as a proof for the growth of *kāvya* in the middle of the second century. Although it is composed in an old Prakrit very much nearer to Pāli, still the results that may follow from its examination would of course be equally applicable to Sanskrit poetry, as there exists no separating barrier between Prakrit and Sanskrit *kāvyas*. As far as the information provided by the *Alaṅkāra-śāstra* goes, both Sanskrit and Prakrit compositions are regarded as branches of a common stem and are both bound by the same laws. Accordingly, we find that all the known Prakrit *kāvyas* are composed in obedience to the same canons as are those written in Sanskrit. They present the same varieties of style and the same types and the same *alaṅkāras*, and it happens not seldom that one and the same author uses both Prakrit and Sanskrit. Even the author of our inscription must have known Sanskrit and been expert in Sanskrit *kāvya* also, because he appears to be guilty of some Sanskriticisms. The compound *Vijhachavanta* (line 2) appears to be but a transliteration of the Sanskrit *Vindhyarkṣavat*, since the Greek from *Ouzegios* shews that the Prakrit name of the Ṛkṣavat began with *u.*[*] Another apparently Sanskrit *sandhi* is found in *Kesavājuna* (line 8), where the rule of the Prakrit demands *Kesav-ajuna*, i.e., *Kesavajjuna.*[6] So also the form *pitupatiyo* (line 11) occurring in a writing of such a late date, must be looked upon as only an archaic imitation of *pitṛpatnyoḥ.*[7] As far as I know, this is the only instance of a genitive in the dual number, which has been entirely lost even in older Prakrit literature. It is even possible that the inscription might have been at first composed in Sanskrit and then translated or transliterated, as the Prakrit, which resembled Pāli, was then, as even in much later times, the official language in Southern India.[8] Whatever may be the case, so much is certain that the author was acquainted with the Sanskrit language as well as the Sanskrit literature.

---

[3] *Arch. Sur. W. Ind.*, Vol. IV, p. 106 (No. 14, last line).

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 105, where 14 is to be corrected to 18. [See *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. I, 1965, p. 198.—D.C.S.]

[5] Cf. also Bhaṇḍārkar's remarks in his *Early History of the Dekkan*, pp. 20 ff., where the date of the inscription is placed somewhat earlier. In several particulars, I cannot agree with Bhaṇḍārkar. [Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi occupied the Nasik-Poona region from Usabhadāta about the 18th year of his reign, which roughly corresponded to the latest known date of Nahapāna, i.e. year 46=124 A.D.—D.C.S.]

---

[*] [*Acchavanta* for *Ṛkṣavat* is quite correct.—D.C.S.]

[6] [Another form of *Ajjuna* seems to be *Ājuna*.—D.C.S.]

[7] [The rendering is doubtful.—D.C.S.]

[8] See on this my remarks on the Prakrit Pallava land grant in the *Epigraphia Indica*, [Vol. I—D.C.S.], pp. 4 f.

His work is a *gadya-kāvya* like the Girnār inscription discussed above and belongs to the class of *praśastis*. After the date given in quite an official manner, there follows the description of the king of kings Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi written in a high poetic style, which together with the shorter praise of his mother Gautamī Balaśrī and of the cave prepared by her, in all, covers eight lines and a half, and altogether makes a gigantic sentence. Then there come at the end two short sentences which say that the queen gave away the cave to the Bhadrāyanīya monks and that her grandson Puḷumāyi assigned the village Piśācīpadraka for the preservation of the sculpture and pictures. In these concluding sentences, the language is quite business-like; but even there we find the use of some figures on a small scale. In the first of these, the mother is described by means of three epithets giving rise to alliteration, *Mahādevī Mahārāja-mātā Mahārāja-pitāmahī*; in the second, the king is spoken of not by name, but as *Mahādevīya ajjakāya sevākāmo piyakāmo ṇa[tā Sakaladakhiṇā]-pathesaro,*[9] 'the grandson ever willing to serve and please the queen the grand-mother, the lord of the whole of the Deccan.' Thus even here the author does not forget his profession altogether.

As for the first and the main part of the *praśasti*, its style entirely resembles that of the Girnār *praśasti* in that long compounds are used to bring out *ojas* or the force of language. These run on almost exclusively from line 2, to line 6; then in line 7, the almost breathless reader is favoured with a resting pause, inasmuch as only short words are used. In the last line and a half of the description of the king, the poet again takes a new leaf and uses towards the end the longest compound which contains sixteen words with forty-three letters (*Pavana-Garuḷa*, etc.). The *Anuprāsa* is more liberally used, as is the case with the Girnār *praśasti*. Thus we have in line 2 *Asika-Asaka*, in line 3 *pavata-patisa*, *divasakara-kara*, *kamala-vimala*, in the last parts of the compound in lines 3-4 *sāsanasa*, *vadanasa*, *vāhanasa*, *dasanasa*, and many more similar expressions. In one point, however, the Nāsik inscription differs from the Girnār *praśasti*. While the latter disdains the use of the conventional similes of court poets, these are found in our *praśasti* in a very large number and are sometimes very striking too. Just the very first epithet of the king *Himavata-Meru-Madara-pavata-sama-sārasa*, 'whose essence resembles that of the mountains Himavat, Meru and Mandara', is conceived quite in the *kāvya* style. Thus the author shows that comparisons of the king with these mountains, so favourite in later times, were in vogue even in his day. What he, in reality, means by the phrase in question is that Śātakarṇi was possessed of great treasures, like the Himālaya, that he was the central point of the world, and overshadowed the same with his height, like the Meru, and that like the Mandara which was used as a rod by the gods at the time of churning out nectar, he knew how to bring to light and to acquire for himself Lakṣmī, the *Fortuna regum*.

---

[9] [*Ṇa[tā Puḷumāyi Dakhiṇa]pathesaro.*—D.C.S.]

The correctness of this explanation can be easily demonstrated. For, the idea that the Himālaya hides within himself immeasurable treasures has been prevalent amongst the Indian people since a very old time, and it finds its expression in mythology, in that the abode of Kubera is located in the Himālaya. To the court poets the idea that riches are the *sāra* of the Himālaya is so obvious that at times they do not express it at all, but only hint at the same. But Kālidāsa says in the *Raghuvaṁśa*, IV. 78—

paraspareṇa vijñātas = teṣ = ūpāyana-pāṇiṣu |
rājñā Himavataḥ sāro rājñaḥ sāraḥ Himādriṇā ||

'As the [Gaṇas came] with presents in their hands, they understood each other's essence; the king, that of the Himālaya (i.e., his riches) and the Himālaya that of the king (i.e., his might).'

Equally old and generally prevalent is the conception that the mountain Meru is the centre of the world; and kings are very frequently compared with the same, in *kāvyas*, in order to illustrate their great might. Thus, in the beginning of the *Kādambarī*, Bāṇa says (Peterson's ed., p. 5, line 11) of king Sūdraka—

Merur = iva sakala-bhuvan-opajīvyamāna-pāda-cchāyaḥ,

'He resembles Meru in that all the worlds live in the shadow of his feet,' i.e., are preserved through his protection, just as they live in the shadow of the spur of the mountain. The comparison is also found in the inscriptions, e.g., in the *praśasti* which forms a prelude to the grant of land made by the Caulukya king Mūlarāja I. It is said there[10] (line 3): *Merur = iva sarvadā madhyasthaḥ*, 'He resembles Meru, in that he is always *madhyastha*, i.e., the the centre of the world, and impartial.'

As for the mountain Mandara, it is one the most well-known myths, according to which it served the gods as a churning-rod, at the churning of the milk-ocean. As on that occasion, Lakṣmī, the goddess of wealth, came out, and she is often described as the representative of the royal power and splendour and even as the consort of kings, the kings themselves are often compared with the Mandara mountain in order to hint at the idea that they churn out Fortune from the ocean of the enemies. Thus in the *Harṣacarita* (Kashmir ed., p. 227, line 7), Bāṇa says, while describing king Puṣyabhūti, that he was *Mandara-maya iva Lakṣmī-samākarṣaṇe*, 'Mandara-like in drawing out Lakṣmī.' This same thought is further elaborated in verse 7 of the Aphsaḍ *praśasti*,[11] a composition of the seventh century, written in a high Gauḍa style, where it is said of king Kumāragupta—

---

[10] See *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI, p. 191. My translation as given there mentions only the second meaning of *madhyastha*. It is, however not improbable that the writer also means to say that Mūlarāja was the centre of the world, although the expression cannot apply to a petty ruler who possessed only a few miles of land. Such considerations, however, have no weight with a court poet.

bhīmaḥ śr-Īśānavarma- kṣitipati-śaśinaḥ sainya-dugdh-oda-sindhur=
Lakṣmī-samprāpti-hetuḥ sapadi vimathito Mandarībhūya yena ||

'Who became the Mandara and immediately churned out the terrible army of the illustrious Īśānavarman, a moon amongst princes, the army, which was the means of the acquisition of Fortune, and thus resembled the milk-ocean.' A still more artificial representation of the simile is found in the *praśastis* of the Rāṭhor king Govinda II, verse 3, belonging to the beginning of the ninth century. I have explained it fully in the translation of the passage.

In the face of these facts, it cannot be doubted that the author of the Nāsik inscription intended to say or to hint all that is contained in the explanation given above;[12]

---

[11] *Corp. Inscr. Ind.*, Vol. p. 203, line 7.

[12] It is just possible that he had in view even other less important qualities of the mountains named here. Thus, as the Meru is the abode of the *vibudha* or the gods, and as *vibudha* also means 'a wise man', the comparison of the king with the Meru may imply a compliment to the effect that the king was surrounded by wise councillors and learned men. Cf., for instance, *Vāsavadattā*, p. 14, line 1—*Merur=iva vibudh-ālayaḥ*.

and when we see that he dares to express himself in such an extra-ordinarily cousise manner and is content with only alluding to the *sāra* of the three mountains, we cannot but suppose that, in the first place, he knew all the myths in question and, in the second place, the comparisons of kings with these mountains were in vogue then; for otherwise the expression in question would have been quite unintelligible to the hearer. The comparisons involved in the epithets in the next lines 3-4 are some of them so familar that it is not necessary to demonstrate their occurrence in the *kāvya*. This is the case, for instance, with the phrase *divaskara-kara-vibodhita-kamala-vimala-ṡadisa-vadanasa*, 'whose face resembles a spotless lotus which the sun's rays have awakened [from the nocturnal sleep]', on which we should only remark that the use of the word *kara*, which also means 'hand,' is not unitentional. Equally common-place is the comparison in *paṭipuna-cada-maḍala-sasirīka-piya-dasanasa*, 'whose appearance is lovely and lustrous like the full moon.' But as the face has been spoken of before, the author uses *dasana* for *vadana* and thus varies somewhat the usual idea. Lastly, no examples are necessary for *vara-vāraṇa-vikama-cāru-vikamasa*, 'whose gait is beautiful like that of a lordly elephant', and *bhujagapati-bhoga-pīna-vāṭa-vipula-digha-sudara-bhujasa* 'whose arms strong, round, massive, long and beautiful like the coils of the prince of serpents'. With regard to the last epithet, it must be observed, in the meanwhile, that the author has taken great troubles to give a new unusual form to the old comparison of the arm of a warrior with a serpent, already very usual in the epics. For the purpose, he mentions the serpent-prince Śeṣa instead of some other favourite serpent and piles together a number of adjectives. The first of these things is often done by court poets; e.g., in the *Raghuvaṁśa*, XIV. 31, Kālidāsa describes Kāma as *sarpādhirāj-oru-bhuja.* Somewhat rare is the absurd notion *ti-samuda-toya-pīta-vāhanasa,* 'whose armies drink the water of the three oceans', though sanctioned by the usage of Indian poets. Similar expressions are now and then met with in panegyrics and *praśastis,* with a view to suggest that the victorious armies have passed forward to the shores of the ocean. A rhetorician remarks that the water of the ocean would never be drunk. But nevertheless the poets very frequently uses expressions like the one above, which, therefore, cannot be looked upon as involving a breach of *aucitya.*[13]

The following lines contain nothing useful for our purpose. Their object is to represent Śātakarṇi as a ruler who lived up to the rules of *Nītiśāstra.* On the other hand, the short epithets in line 7 remind us of several passages in the descriptions of heroes and haroines by Bāṇa who also frequently interrupts the long winded compounds and the tiring rows of comparisons, in quite a similar manner, and now and then makes use of similar expressions in such cases. The correctness of what we say will be best shown by placing this part of the inscription side by side with a passage, in Bāṇa's *Kādambarī,* from the description of king Śūdraka—[14]

(a) *āgamāna nilayasa sapurisāna asayasa sirīya adhiṭhānasa upacārāna pabhavasa eka-kusasa eka-dhanudharasa eka-surasa eka-bamhaṇasa.*

(b) *kartā mahādharmāṇām=āhartā kratūnām=ādarśaḥ sarva-śāstrāṇām=utpattiḥ kulānāṁ kula-bhavanaṁ guṇānām=āgamaḥ kāvyāmṛta-rasānām=Udayaśailo mitra-maṇḍalasy=otpāta-ketur=*

---

[13] See, for instance, the Udepur *praśasti,* verse 10 (*Ep. Ind.,* [Vol. I.—D.C.S.], p. 234).

The name of the rhetorician I have unfortunately not noted.

[14] *Kādambarī,* p. 5, lines 12-16; cf. also p. 56, lines 7-8.

ahita-janasya pravartayitā goṣṭhī-bandhānām=āśrayo rasikānāṁ pratyādeśo dhanuṣmatāṁ dhaureyaḥ sāhasikānām=agraṇīr=vidagdhānām.

Of course Bāṇa's expressions are much more choice, and they show a considerable advance in the development of the style. Nevertheless, certain similarity is unmistakable and the reason why simpler epithets are inserted in the midst of more complicate ones is no doubt the same in both the cases. In line 8, we meet with two long compounds which compare Śātakarṇi with the heroes of the *Mahābhārata* as well as with the kings of yore described in that work—'Whose bravery was similar to that of Rāma (Halabhṛt), Keśava, Arjuna and Bhīmasena', and 'whose lustre resembled that of Nābhāga, Nahuṣa, Janamejaya, Śaṁkara,[15] Yayāti, Rāma [of the Raghu race] and Ambarīṣa. Further, these two compounds are separated, certainly not without intention, by another epithet inserted between them. Comparisons with the kings of epic tales are as a rule used by Subandhu and Bāṇa, in the descriptions of their heroes, who, however, work out in a far finer way. They bring out the similarity in particular points by means of a *śleṣa* on every name or show that their heroes surpass by far the old heroes; in that they go more deeply into the original.[16] Here, in our inscriptions, we have to do with the beginnings of a development which reached its high point certainly in the seventh century, or perhaps even much earlier.

To the great significance of the immediately following passage, I have already alluded (*Nava-Sāhasāṅkacarita of*

---

[15] [Sagara.—D.C.S.]

[16] Cf. for instance, *Vāsavadattā*, p. 15; p. 22, line 1; p. 27, line 3; p. 122, lines 4-5, and especially the passage from the *Harṣacarita* referred to by Cartellieri, *Wiener Zeitschrift f.d. Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Vol. I, p. 126.

Padmagupta, pp. 48 ff.)—'who standing in the forefront defeated the hosts of his enemies, in a battle in which, in a manner immeasurable, eternal, incomprehensible and marvellous, the wind, Garuḍa, the Siddhas, Yakṣas, Rākṣasas, Vidyādharas, Bhūtas, Gandharvas, Cāraṇas, the sun, the moon, stars and planets took part.'[17] It is just the oldest instance of a mixture of history and mythology, so usual in the later court poets. As Bilhaṇa repeatedly makes Siva to interfere in the fortunes of his patron, Vikramāditya, or as Hemacandra surrounds his master Jayasiṁha-Siddharāja with supernatural beings, or as Padmagupta-Parimala reduces the history of the life of Siddharāja[18] to a pure myth, so has here our author given heavenly powers as confederates to the father of his master. This passage thus provides us with an interesting point of connection between our inscription and the style of narration of the court poets. About the meaning of the next phrase, unfortunately we are not sure, as the first letter can be read as *nā* or *ṇa*. If we read *ṇagavara-khadhā gaganatalam=abhivigāḍhasa*, as is most probably the case, then it would be rendered thus—'who towered up higher in heaven than the shoulder of a great mountain, or the trunk of a grand tree.'[19] With this we may compare the *Raghuvaṁśa*, XVIII. 16, where it is said of king Pāriyātra—

Uccaiḥ-śirastvāj=jita-Pāriyātraṁ
Lakṣmīḥ siṣeve kila Pāriyātram//

---

[17] Bhaṇḍārkar and Bhagvānlāl translate *vicina*—which I have freely rendered as 'in which took part', by 'witnessed'. The reason why I do not follow this meaning is that no examples of this meaning accepted by the two gentlemen are known to me; on the contrary, *yuddhaṁ vicar*, 'to fight a battle', is given in the Petersburg Lexicon.

[18] [Sindhurāja.—D.C.S.]

[19] The ablative implies here, as is often the case in Sanskrit, that the Positive form has the sense of the Comparative.

'Fortune resorted, indeed, to [king] Pāriyātra, the height of whose head surpassed [the mountain] Pāriyātra.'

If, on the other hand, we read *nāgavara-khadhā*, then we must translate—'who went up into the heaven from the shoulder of his lordly elephant.' The meaning then would correspond to that of verse 20 in the Lakhā Maṇḍal *praśasti*,[20] where it is said of Candragupta, the consort of the princess Īśvarā of Siṁhapura—

bhartari gatavati nākaṁ kariṇaḥ skandhāt

'As her husband ascended to heaven from the shoulder of his elephant......'

These words describe Candragupta's death, and would mean that he fell from an elephant, and had his neck broken, or that he, while fighting on elephant-back in the battle, met with a hero's death, or perhaps that he exchanged the splendour of the earthly life of a prince for heaven. The second alternative seems to be the most probable. At any rate, the passage referring to Śātakarṇi will have to be understood thus, in case the reading *nāga* is the correct one.

In the remaining lines, we have first the praise of queen Gautamī Balaśrī, 'who, in every way, acted as worthy of her title "the wife of a royal sage";' secondly, the very bold, though improper, comparison of the mountain Triraśmi with a peak of the Kailāsa mountain, and lastly the assurance that the cave possessed a magnificence which equalled that of a lordly palace of the gods. All these three notions are most usual in the *kāvyas*. Instances of the third have been already mentioned by us above.

What we have said so far should quite suffice to prove that the Nāsik inscription No. 18, also, bears a close relationship with the *gadya-kāvyas* preserved for us, and that it especially contains many comparisons current in the latter. It must, however, be repeated that this *praśasti* occupies a considerably lower rank than the prose parts in Hariṣeṇa's *kāvya*, and is still less artificial than the works of Subandhu, Bāṇa and Daṇḍin.

---

[20] *Ep. Ind.*, p. 13. [Lakkhāmaṇḍal *praśasti* (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. I, p. 13).—D.C.S.]

VI

Conclusions and their Bearing on the Theory of Renaissance of Sanskrit Literature

Now we propose to sum up the results following from the detailed examination carried on so far. In the second century of our era, there existed *gadya-kāvya* which resembled the Classical samples of the same, not only in respect of the fundamental principles, but in many details also. Like the rhetoricians and writers of the fourth and the following centuries, the poets of the second century regarded the essence of the *gadya-kāvya* as consisting in the frequent use of *Sesquipedalia verba*. Like the later authors, they were fond of constructing very long sentences, a thing which depended for the most part, on the length and number of compound words. However, they permitted, to the reciter and the hearer, resting pauses between long compounds by inserting shorter words or phrases made up of shorter words, some of which are not unlike those inserted for the same purpose in the Classical samples of works written in high prose. Of the *Alaṅkāras*, the poets make use of the Alliteration, *Upamā*, *Utprekṣā*, and *Rūpaka*, and at any rate, an attempt at *Śleṣa*. As compared with what we find in the Classical works, the figures of speech are in the first place, used much more rarely, and in the second place, are executed with much less care and skill. Sometimes these rise not at all, or only very little, above the level of what is found in the epics. So also we are reminded of the language of the epics by the several grammatical forms which are used by the author of the *praśasti* of the Sudarśana lake. On the other hand, the arbitrary intermixture of history with mythology found in the Nāsik *praśasti* just corresponds to a tendency which, in much later *kāvyas*, comes to view very strongly.[1]

Side by side with works written in high prose, there existed, as is to be expected, and as is distinctly shown by the Girnār *praśasti*, metrical works whose form essentially agreed with the rules laid down, in the oldest available manuals, for the Vaidarbha style. Further, this accordance with rules naturally points to the existence of an *Alaṅkāra-śāstra* or some theory of the poetic art. Both these kinds of composition were equally esteemed with the Brāhmaṇic science, at the courts of Indian princes and in spite of the lacunae in the Girnār inscriptions, it is hardly to be doubted that a personal occupation with poesy is ascribed to the king and Great Satrap Rudradāman, the grandson of a non-Aryan* governor of an Indo-Scythian ruler. Be this right or not, it is in any case quite evident that the poesy, resembling the Classical *kāvya* in essential features, enjoyed royal favour in the second century, as it did in later times, and that it was cultivated at the Indian courts. In no case can it be said that the Brāhmaṇic science and literature were extinguished by the invasions and the rule of the barbarian foreigners (as an Indian would say). If we suppose that the *praśasti* informs us of pure historical truth, then its contents clearly show that the life of literature in the second century must have attained to such a richness and strength as to win over to itself even the descendants of barbarians. Thus it naturally follows that the *kāvya* could not have been a new discovery in the second century ; but it must have had a long previous history which went back to the times when Aryan princes were the exclusive rulers of India. For this reason, it would not be certainly going too far to assert that the Girnār *praśasti* makes probable the existence of the *kāvya* style, even in the first century.

---

[1] According to my view, what the two inscriptions present must be looked upon as the minimum of the development of poesy at that time, and not as the maximum. It appears to me very probable that, in the second century, there had been many superior and more elaborate compositions, because the author of the Girnār inscription was only an obscure provincial writer, and the author of the Nāsik inscription was only a court poet of the Andhra king; it is, however, very questionable whether the poetic art had reached, in Souhtern India, that degree of development which it had reached at the special centres of intellectual life in Northern India. It would be a strange change, indeed, if the two inscriptions presented to us a completely accurate picture of the stage of development in which Indian poesy was at that time.

* [Non-Indian.—D.C.S.]

A very large number of *praśastis* go to prove that in the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries, the *kāvya* literature was in its full bloom and that the *kāvyas* did not at all differ from those handed down to us. The second independent Gupta king whose reign, no doubt, covered the greatest part of the second half of the fourth century, Samudragupta-Parākramāṅka, was himself a poet, and received from his admirers the title *Kavirāja*. He supported several poets, who at the same time were Paṇḍits, and put an end, as far as he could, to the old antagonism between the Muses and Plutus. His courtiers followed the example of their master, and the penegyric by Hariṣeṇa, 'the minister of foreign affairs and the counsellor of the prince royal',* shows that Samudragupta had at least one poet, of whom he had no reason to be ashamed.

Heriṣeṇa's *kāvya* is in every respect an artistically finished little work, which places its author in a line with Kālidāsa and Daṇḍin. Its style is that of the Vaidarbha School. The very fact that Hariṣeṇa himself belonged to the north-east of India shows that, there must have preceded his time, a period of literature, during which, poets from Berar in the Northern Deccan, accomplished much, and brought their particular taste to a high repute. Probably this full bloom of the Vaidarbhas will fall in the third century, or at the latest in the beginning of the fourth century. Under Samudragupta's successor, Candragupta II Vikramāditya, poetry must have similarly enjoyed the patrongge of the court, inasmuch as even the king's minister took to himself cleverness in versifying, if not a real poetic talent as such. Even this little composition is written in the style of the Vaidarbha School. The same holds good of the *praśastis* of the time of Kumāragupta and Skandagupta. The works in existence are, however, most insignificant, a phenomenon which is satisfactorily explained by the fact that they were all written by provincial writers. In the second half of the fourth century, in Vatsabhaṭṭi's *praśasti* of the Sun temple at Daśapura-Mandasor, we see traces of the existence of the School of the Gauḍas, the poets of eastern India. This work should be called rather the exercise of a scholar who busied himself with the study of the *kāvya* literature, than the product of an actual poet. We can see therein that its author studied the *kāvyas*, and Rhetorics, but that, in spite of all the troubles he took to produce a real *kāvya*, he possessed little of inborn talent. Small offences against good taste, such as the use of expletives and tautologous words, are more frequently met with. In one place, the author is led to forget one of the most elementary rules of Grammar, by the exigencies of the metre ; in another place, in his zeal to form long compounds, he is tempted to disregard the rule, always observed by good writers, according to which, the weak pause can never come at the end of a half-verse. In a third place, he jumbles together two ideas in a manner the least permissible ; and his attempt to bring out a new comparison between the clouds and the houses leads in no way to a happy result.

---

* [*Kumārāmātya* may be an *Amātya* enjoying the status of a *Kumāra*.—D.C.S.]

These defects in Vatsabhaṭṭi's *praśasti* make it the more important to the historian of literature, inasmuch as they bear testimony to the fact that everything worthy of attention, in the *praśasti*, is gathered from the literature of his time and compiled into a whole. Thus, on the one hand, we are assured of the fact that about the year 472 A.D., there was a rich *kāvya* literature in existence ; and on the other hand, greater weight is gained by the points of accordance with the works handed down to us, which the *praśasti* presents. It has been already pointed out above that verse 10 of the *praśasti* only repeats, for the most part, the comparison contained in verse 65 of the *Meghadūta*, with some new points added in a very forced way, while the remaining points contained in that verse of Kālidāsa, find themselves repeated in verse 11 of the *praśasti*. Further, it is to be noted that Vatsabhaṭṭi, like Kālidāsa, shows a special predilection for the word *subhaga*, and that he, while describing king Bandhuvarman, plays upon his name just in the same way as Kālidāsa does with the names of the Raghus, whom he describes at the beginning of Sarga XVIII of the *Raghuvaṁśa*. These facts make the conjecture more probable that Vatsabhaṭṭi knew and made use of the works of Kālidāsa. The same view is advocated by Kielhorn in a publication[2] just appearing, which reached me after this treatise was nearly finished. He reads in verse 31 of the *praśasti*—

rāmā-sanātha-bhavan-odara-bhāskar-āṁśu-
vahni-pratāpa-subhage...........

---

[2] 'The Mandasor inscription of the Mālava year 529 (472 A.D.) and Kālidāsa's *Ṛtusaṁhāra*', [*N. K. G. W.*—D.C.S.], Göttingen, 1890, pp. 251 ff.

instead of °*bhavane dara*°, and shows that the verse sufficiently agrees with the *Ṛtusaṁhāra*, V. 2-3, in both words and thoughts, as there are only two new points added. Although I am not in a position, without examining a good impression of the inscription, to give a definite opinion regarding the proposed, and no doubt very interesting, alteration of the text, still the truth of his assertion that verse 31 of the *praśasti* is an imitation of the *Ṛtusaṁhāra*, V. 3-3, appears to me quite undeniable. If we may believe in the tradition[3] which ascribes the *Ṛtusaṁhāra* to the author of the *Meghadūta*, then the point overlooked by me, which Kielhorn has made out, strengthens the probability of the supposition that Kālidāsa lived before 472 A.D., which is very significant. In that case, however, it will have to be assumed that Vatsabhaṭṭi knew the *Ṛtusaṁhāra* also.

One of these conclusions,—the statement that the Indian artificial poetry had developed itself not after, but before the beginning of our era,—is confirmed also by references in a literary work which is by all means old. Whosoever goes through the collection of poetic citations from the *Mahābhāṣya*, which Kielhorn has brought together in *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XIV, pp. 326 ff., cannot but see that the *kāvya* prospered in Patañjali's time. Many of the verses exhibit metres characteristic of the artificial poetry, such as *Mālatī*, *Pramitākṣarā*, *Praharṣiṇī* and *Vasantatilakā*. These verses as well as many others[4] in the heroic *Anuṣṭubh-Śloka* agree, in point of contents as well as the mode of expressions, not with epic works, but with the court *kāvyas*. The composition of the *Mahābhāṣya* can now indeed no longer be placed with certainty in the middle of the second century before Christ, as was the case generally up till very recently; because the uncertainty of the known arguments of Goldstucker and others has become more and more evident with the time.[5] In the meanwhile, according to what Kielhorn in his article,[5a] 'The Grammarian Pāṇini', has said about the relation of Bhartṛhari and the *Kāśikā* to the *Mahābhāṣya*, and for reasons of language and style, we cannot establish for Patañjali a later *terminus ad quem* than something like the first century after Christ. Thus the passages from Patañjali show at any rate, as Kielhorn remarks in *Ind. Ant.*, *loco citato*, 'that the so-called Classical poetry is older than it has lately been represented to be.' A further proof for the early growth of the Sanskrit *kāvya* is provided by a Buddhist work, the *Buddhacarita* of Aśvaghoṣa, whose Chinese translation was prepared between 414 and 421 A.D. The work is not a *mahākāvya* in name only, but is written in the *kāvya* style, as we may judge from the samples given by Bendall.[6] Beal, the translator of the Chinese version, looks upon the Buddhist tradition as right ;[7] according to this, the author, Aśvaghoṣa, was a contemporary of Kaṇiṣka (78 A.D.). Even if we lay aside this difficult question and take our stand on the date of its translation, which is beyond doubt, the work would still possess great worth from the point of view of the history of literature. The composition of the work in question cannot be placed in any case later than 350-400 A.D. Even the bare fact that a Buddhist monk, as early as this, thought of writing the legend of the Buddha, according to the rules of the poetic art, establishes a great popularity of the Brāhmaṇic artificial poetry and confirms the conclusions, arrived at above, by the analysis of Hariṣeṇa's *praśasti*. A thorough examination of the *Buddhacarita*, and a comparison of its style with that of older *kāvyas* and with the rules of the oldest manual of Rhetorics will, without doubt, lead to more definite and more important results.*

---

[3] This tradition is, at any rate, older than Vallabhadeva's *Subhāṣitāvalī*, which belongs probably to the first half of the fifteenth century. In it, are quoted two verses from the *Ṛtusaṁhāra*, No. 1674 (= *Ṛtus.*, VI. 17) and No. 1678 (=*Ṛtus.*, VI. 20), under the name *Kālidāsaya*. In the note to the first of these, the editors wrongly attribute it to the *Kumārasambhava*, VI. 17. The mistake has been rather due to a misprint. Two other verses from the *Ṛtusaṁhāra* have been cited in the same anthology, but without a mention of the particular author. Vallabha has probably taken them from some older work on which the author's name was not given.

---

[4] In this connection, one should notice the quotations from Vol. I. pp. 426, 435; Vol. II, p. 119; Vol. III, pp. 143, 338 (Kielhorn's edition of the *Bhāṣya*).

[5] According to the communication of Paṇḍit N. Bhāskarācārya, 'The Age of Patañjali', Adyar Series, No. 1, p. 4, the two old Mss. from the South are unfavourable to one, historically important, word. not contested till now, inasmuch as they do not read *Mauryaiḥ*, but *pauraiḥ* in the well-known passage on Pāṇ., V. 3,99. Although the treatise mentioned above contains very little else that is noteworthy, still this point requires to be investigated further especially as Southern Mss. have not been available for the *Bhāṣya* up till now.

[5a] *Nachrichten der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Göttingen, 1885, pp. 185 ff.

If one compares the conclusions, set forth in this essay, with the views of other Sanskritists regarding the history of Indian *kāvya*, it will be found that they are entirely incompatible, expecially with those which Max Müller has argued out, in his famous dissertation[8] on the Renaissance of Sanskrit Literature; and thus I am not, in this case, in a position to agree with the literary-historical suppositions of my honoured friend and to build further on the same, as I have done many times on other occasions. His first proposition that the Indians did not show any literary activity during the first and second centuries of our era, in consequence of the inroads of the different foreign races, is contradicted by the clear proof provided by the *praśasti* of the Sudarśana lake and the Nāsik inscription No. 18. I think, I must further add that the extinction of the intellectual life of the Indians during the said two centuries by the Scythians and other foreigners is improbable for other reasons also. In the first place, never had the foreigners brought under their sway, in the long run, more than a fifth part of India. To the east of the district of Mathurā, no sure indications of their rule have been found, and the reports of the Greeks ascribe to the Indo-Scythian kingdom no further extent in the east or south. In India proper, the kingdom could permanently possess only the Panjab, besides the high valleys of the Himālaya, the extreme west of North-Western Provinces, Eastern Rājputānā, Central India Agency, with Gwalior and Mālwā, Gujarat with Kāṭhiāwāṛ, as well as Sind. No doubt temporarily these limits are further extended in several cases, as the inscriptions from the reign of Nahapāna prove for the western border of the Deccan, and several traces of war might present themselves in further removed districts. The rulers of such a kingdom could indeed have exerted a considerable influence on the east of India, but they would never have been able to suppress the literary and scientific life of the Indians. Secondly, however,—and this is the most important point—the very will to show a hostile attitude towards the Indian culture was wanting in the foreign kings of the time, as the sayings and authentic documents inform us. They themselves, as well as their comrades of the same race, were far inferior to the Indians in point af civilisation and culture, and the natural result was that they could not escape the influence of the Indian civilisation, but were themselves Hinduised. Their willingness to appropriate the culture of their subjects is shown by the very fact that the descendants or successors of the foreign conquerors immediately began to bear Indian names, even in the second generation. Huviṣka's successor is indeed a Ṣāhi; but he is named Vāsudeva. Nahapāna's daughter is named Dakṣamitrā and his son-in-law, the son of Dinīka, a Śaka, is named Uṣavadāta or Usabhadāta, i.e., Ṛṣabhadatta. The son of Caṣṭana is Jayadāman. The leaning of the kings to the Indian systems of religion is equally indisputable. According to the Buddhist tradition, Kaṇiṣka is one of the greatest patrons of Buddhism and even became a Buddhist himself. The latter fact is indeed shown to be improbable by the inscriptions on his coins. On the other hand, there is no doubt that he built a *stūpa* and a *vihāra* at Puruṣapura-Peshawar. So also it is proved from the inscriptions that Huviṣka had founded a *vihāra* at Mathurā.[9] Uṣavadāta and his consort, according to the Nāsik and Karle inscriptions,[10] made grants to Buddhists and Brāhmaṇas without distinction, and the former, just like a pious Indian, carried out numerous works of public utility for the sake of merit. The Mathurā inscriptions further show that under Kaṇiṣka and his successors, by the side of Buddhism, many other systems of religion, like Jainism, were not also only tolerated, but enjoyed a high prosperity. These inscriptions as well as numerous archaeological finds also prove that the national Indian architecture and sculptures at Mathurā were of a high level, and one of the newest discoveries of Führer permits us to conclude that even the dramatic art was cultivated in the city of gods. Inscription No. 18, out of the collection prepared by me for the next number of the *Epigraphia Indica*,* says that 'the sons of the actors of Mathurā (*Mathurānaṁ śailālakānaṁ*) who were known as Cāndaka brothers, dedicated a stone-slab, for the redemption of their parents, at the holy place of the adorable Nāga-prince, Dadhikarṇa.' If Mathurā had its company of actors, then it would not have been in want of dramas. All these circumstances make it impossible, in my opinion, to look upon the time of Indian popular migration as a period of wild barbarism. The conditions appear to be in no way essentially different from those of the times when there were national rulers. The Indians of the north-west and the west had indeed to obey foreign suzerains and to pay them tributes and taxes; in return for which, however, they had the triumph of exerting sway on their subjugators, through their high culture, and of assimilating the same with themselves. The conditions necessary for literary activity must have been in existence, when an Uṣavadāta noted his great deeds in a mixture of Sanskrit and Prakrit itself.[11] He would certainly have lent his ear and opened his purse to bards and *kavis* who would glorify him. These considerations appear to me to be of importance for the statements in the Girnār *praśasti* and heighten their significance.

---

[6] *Catalogue of Buddhist Sansk. Mss.*, p. 82.

[7] *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. XIX, pp. xxx ff.

* [A number of stanzas in the Classical metres and in the *kāvya* style are found in inscriptions belonging to the age of the Śakas of Mathurā about the beginning of the first century A.D. Cf. *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I, 1965, p. 122; cf. p. 187; *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. II, p. 200, No. 7.—D.C.S.]

[8] *India, what can it teach us?* pp. 281 ff. On the other hand Lassen's views regarding the development of *kāvya* come pretty near to the results given above. As he had studied the inscriptions, it was but natural that the significance of the Girnār inscription and of Hariṣeṇa's *praśasti* did not escape his observation ; see *Indische Alterthumskunde*, Part II, pp. 1159 f., 1169 f.

---

[9] Cunningham, *Arch. Surv. Rep.*, Vol. III, Plate XIV, No. 12.

[10] *Arch. Surv. Rep., West. Ind.*, Vol. IV, pp. 99 ff.

A second proposition which Max Müller in addition to other scholars advocates,—that the real period of the bloom of artificial poetry is to be placed in the middle of the sixth century after Christ,—is contradicted by the testimony of the Allahābād *praśasti* of Hariṣeṇa, of other compositions of the Gupta period and of the Mandasor

---

* [Vol. II, pp. 195 ff.—D.C.S.]

[11] *Arch. Surv. Rep., West. Ind., loc. cit.*, No. 5, lines 3 ff.

praśasti. These leave no doubt about the fact that there were not one but several such periods of the bloom of the *kāvya*, of which one fell before the time of Samudragupta, and that they also make it probable that Kālidāsa wrote before 472 A.D. The same conclusion is favoured by the fact that Fergusson's bold chronological combinations, on which is based the theory of the Indian Renaissance in the sixth century, have been shown to be insupportable by the researches of Fleet. The authentic documents going down to the year 533 A.D. know absolutely nothing about the Vikramāditya of Ujjain, whose existence is inferred or set up by new interpretations of the different legends, and who is reported to have driven away the Scythians from India and to have founded the Vikrama era in the year 544 A.D., dating it as far backwards as 600 years. On the contrary, they prove the following facts concerning Western India. Samudragupta Parākramāṅka, according to Fleet's inscription No. II, extended the kingdom of his father, at any rate as far as Erāṇ in the Central Provinces. His son Candragupta II Vikramāditya, according to No. III, conquered Mālwā before or in the year 400 A.D. and also possessed Mathurā. Candragupta's son, Kumāragupta I Mahendrāditya, held fast these possessions, because, according to No. XVIII, he was the suzerain of the rulers of Daśapura-Mandasor, in the year 437 A.D. His son, Skandagupta Kramāditya or Vikramāditya, according to No. XIV, ruled over Gujarāt and Kāṭhiāwāṛ, about 455-57 or 456-58 A.D. In his time, the Hūṇas came forth, against whom he made a successful stand, according to No. XIII. Later on, however, whether it was in his own reign which lasted at least till the year 467 or 468 A.D., or under his successors, Puragupta and Narasiṁhagupta,[12] the western-most possessions were lost and went over to the foreign race. In Nos. XXXVI and XXXVII, there appear the kings, Toramāṇa and Mihirakula,[13] as rulers of Erāṇ and Gwalior, and in No. XXXVII, the latter is said to have reigned for fifteen years. The end of the rule of Mihirakula in these districts is made known to us through Nos. XXXIII, XXXIV and XXXV, according to which he was defeated by king Yaśodharman-Viṣṇuvardhana before the year 533 A.D. These inscriptions represent Yaśodharman as a very powerful ruler who had brought under his sway not only Western India from Daśapura-Mandasor down to the ocean, but also large parts in the east and north.[14] In his possessions, Mālwā was naturally included, whose capital Ujjain lies only something like 70 English miles to the south of Daśapura. In No. XXXV, and in the two considerably early inscriptions, Nos. XVII and XVIII, the Mālava era is used, which is identical with the so-called Vikrama era beginning with 56-57 B.C.[15] These exceedingly important discoveries, which we owe to Fleet's zeal in collecting data, and his ingenuity prove the absolute untenableness of the Fergussonian hypothesis. Because they shew—(1) that the era of 56-57 B.C. was not founded in the sixth century, but was then in use under the name of the Mālava era for more than a century ;[16] (2) that at that time, no Śakas could have been driven from Western India, inasmuch as the country had been conquered by the Guptas more than a hundred years ago; (3) that on the contrary, other foreign conquerors, the Hūṇas, were driven out[17] of Western India in the first half of the sixth century not, however, by a Vikramāditya, but by Yośodharman-Viṣṇuvardhana, and (4) that, therefore, there is no room at all in the sixth century, for a powerful Vikramāditya of Ujjain, whose exploits called forth a national upheaval in India.

---

[12] See Hoernle, *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.*, Vol. LVIII, p. 89, and Fleet, *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XIX, p. 224. [Read *Pūrugupta* for *Puragupta*.—D.C.S.]

---

[13] See also Fleet's article on Mihirakula, *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XV, pp. 245 ff., and on Toramāṇa, *ibid.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 225. With Hoernle (*op. cit.*, p. 96, note 2), I hold that Viṣṇuvardhana is a second name of Yaśodharman, as is shown by the grammatical construction.

[14] [This king's claim of conquest of India is conventional and not historical—D.C.S.]

[15] See also *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XV, pp. 194 ff., and Vol. XIX, p. 56, in which latter place, Kielhorn has given the right explanation of the difficult expression *Mālavānāṁ°* or *Mālava-gaṇa-sthiti*. [The Vikrama era begins from 58-57 B.C.—D.C.S.]

[16] As is quite clear, the Mālava era has suffered the same fate as the Śaka era and came to be known by another name, since its

Thus, when, with the fall of the Vikramāditya set up by Fergusson, it becomes no longer possible to place in the sixth century, on the same grounds, the writers, whom legends connect with a Vikramāditya, the view which holds that the leaders of the Indian poetic art belonged to this period, will be also compelled to support itself by other arguments and to produce a proof for every one of these writers in particular. What has been adduced, in this connection, about Kālidāsa—in whom alone we are interested here—is, in my opinion, not sufficient to make out even the bare probability of such a fixing of the age. The well-known but hardly accredited verse[18] which

---

origin was forgotten. The change of name appears in the Kaṇaswā inscription, *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XIX, pp. 55 ff. Apart from the two doubtful documents, the oldest known Vikrama date is found in Hultzsch's Dholpur inscription, and corresponds to the 16th April, 842 A.D., as Kielhorn has shown, *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XIX, p. 35.

[17] If it occurs to any one to conjecture that the Hūṇas had caused an interruption in the literary activity of India, I bring to his notice the fact that both the inscriptions of the age of Toramāṇa and Mihirakula contain no mean composition and that their authors glorify the foreign kings as highly as if they had been national rulers.

[18] I purposely speak of the verse only. For, in my opinion, it is not advisable to refer to the Gayā inscription translated by Ch. Wilkins (*As. Res.*, Vol. I, p. 284), but now lost, as a proof for the existence

mentions Kālidāsa as one of the nine jewels at the court of Vikramāditya, and which makes him a contemporary of the astronomer Varāhamihira, loses all its value. Vikramāditya referred to in the verse is, as the *Jyotirvidābharaṇa* shows, the legendary founder of the era of 56-57 B.C. So long as the history of Western India was absolutely unknown, it was at least possible to conjecture that the writers named in the verse would have been contemporaries and lived under a Vikramāditya—whose time was wrongly put later—and that their actual age ought to have been inferred from the sure date of Varāhamihira. But now when we know that in the first half of the sixth century, there never existed a Vikramāditya of Ujjain, it naturally follows that the legend is the more defective. It would be more than a venture to hold as historically true what remains of the legend, namely, the simultaneity of the nine writers.

A second argument[19] which is based on Mallinātha's explanation of the *Meghadūta*, verse 14, can also hold little water, in that it requires us to assume many things, no doubt possible, but incapable of proof, and its conclusion opposed by important considerations. One must, to begin with, take it as proved that Mallinātha was right in asserting that, in the passage in question, Kālidāsa, in the word *dignāgānāṁ* referred to a hated opponent, further that this opponent is identical with the Buddhist teacher Dignāga, so also, that this latter was the pupil of

---

of a tradition of the Nine Jewels. Whosover compares the translation (cf. Murphy's *Travels in Portugal*) of the Cintra inscription by the same learned gentleman with the original will certainly agree with me in that his word is not sufficient to afford us the certainty that the Gayā inscription contained such a striking statement as that of the Nine Jewels.

[19] *India, what can it teach us?*, pp. 300 ff.

Vasubhandhu or Asaṅga,[20] as the Buddhist tradition goes according to Tāranātha and Ratnadharmarāja. Then comes the last and the most questionable link in the chain, i.e., the assigning of the year 550 or so to the two brothers Vasubandhu and Asaṅga, which derives its main support from the untenable theory of the great Vikramāditya of the sixth century. This assumption, as Max Müller himself admits, is contradicted by a Chinese account, according to which, Kumārajīva translated the works of Vasubandhu in the year 404 A.D. The same is further contradicted by Bunyin Nanjio, that the same Kumārajīva translated the life of Vasubandhu, as well as in my opinion, by the existence of Chinese translations of Vasubandhu's works, in the years 508, 509, 508-11 (Bunyin Nanjio, *Catalogue*, Nos. 1168, 1194, 1233).[21]

A third argument[22] which is based on the assumption that Kālidāsa must have lived after Āryabhaṭa (who wrote about 499 A.D.) just because he shows an acquaintance with the scientific astronomy borrowed from the Greeks, has fallen down to the ground, owing to the results of the newest researches. Max Müller, in addition to the views of earlier scholars, held that Āryabhaṭa was the father of scientific Indian astronomy, and assigned the five Siddhāntas selected by Varāhamihira to the sixth century. But this is quite a mistake, according to Thibaut's thorough examination of the question in the introduction to his edition of the *Pañcasiddhāntikā*. Of the five Siddhāntas, two, *Paitāmaha* and *Vāsiṣṭha*, have nothing to do at all with the astronomy borrowed from the Greeks. Of the remaining three, two, *Romaka* and *Pauliśa*, are more incomplete and older than the one ascribed to Sūrya, and all the three, in their form, go backwards even before Āryabhaṭa's works. They are also treated by Varāhamihira, with greater respect than Āryabhaṭa and other individual astronomers. These and other considerations lead Thibaut to fix the year 400 A.D. as the *terminus ad quem* for the *Romaka* and *Pauliśa*.[23] Thus it is no longer necessary to assign Kālidāsa to the sixth century just on the ground that he is acquainted with Greek astronomy. I must still further add that the assertion made by S.P. Paṇḍit and Max Müller that Kālidāsa in the *Raghuvaṁśa*, XIV. 40, traced the lunar eclipse to the shadow of the earth, rests on a misunderstanding. Kālidāsa there, speaks of the spots on the moon, which as the Purāṇas teach us, are called into being by a reflection of the earth.[24] As for the eclipse, he is quite orthodox, as is to be expected of an Indian poet.

---

[20] The two Tibetan writers contradict each other on this point Tāranātha says (*History of Buddhism*, p. 131) that Dignāga was a pupil of Vasubandhu. The second account belongs to Ratnadharmarāja. The older Chinese writers are not aware of this tradition

[21] Beal, according to note 77 to his translation of the *Si-yu-ki*, Vol. I, p. 105, appears to have doubted the fact that Vasubandhu lived in the sixth century A.D. Cf. also p. 106, note 80, where Beal shows that Vasubandhu, according to Hiuen-tsang, lived 'in the middle of' or 'during the period of 350 B.C. 650 A.D.'

[22] *India, what can it teach us?*, pp. 318 ff.

A fourth argument, on which G. Huth lays some stress, in his investigation about Kālidāsa,[25] carried out with much labour, rests on the mention of the Hūṇas, amongst the frontier peoples of India, in the *Raghuvaṁśa*, IV. 68. Huth thinks that it can be assumed that Kālidāsa transferred the conditions of his time to that of Raghu, and that by the Hūṇas are meant, the White Huns. These possessed Kābul twice, once from the end of the second century B.C. to the end of the second century A.D., and again from the beginning of the fifth to the end of the sixth century. Now as it is impossible on various grounds that Kālidāsa should have lived at the time of the first possession, so, Huth further concludes, he must have belonged to the second period, and that naturally the sixth century should be the *terminus ad quem*. The information provided by the Gupta inscriptions, regarding the history of the Hūṇas in India, would very much modify this conclusion. But it is not at all necessary to go into further details, for there is no difficulty in showing the improbability of the very first proposition in the argument, which has not been proved. Indian poets, even when describing the triumphs of historical kings, their very masters and patrons, are frequently quite inaccurate in their geographical and ethnographical accounts, and instead of giving actual facts, they take their stand on the traditional accounts in the epics, Purāṇas and other older works that describe *digvijayas*. Thus Vākpati (about 740 A.D.) makes his master and hero, Yaśovarman of Kanauj, to conquer the Pārasīkas, although the Persian empire was then no longer in existence. Similarly, Bilhaṇa, in the *Vikramāṅkacarita*, XVIII. 34, describes Ananta of Kashmir as conquering the Śakas, and further in 53-57, his son Kalaśa, as conquering the kingdom of the Amazons (*strī-rājya*) after a ride through the ocean of sands, as well as visiting the Kailāsa, the Mānasa lake, and Alakā the city of the Yakṣas. In the face of these facts, it is hard to believe that Kālidāsa, instead of following, as a good *kavi* is supposed to do, the authority of the lists of peoples in the *Mahābhārata* or of the *Bhuvana-vinyāsa* in the Purāṇas, should have occupied himself with the historico-geographical investigations regarding the conditions of the frontier peoples of his time. If we look into his works more carefully, we shall find that they contain much that points to his having made use of the sources mentioned above. The whole of the *digvijaya* contains no names which are not also mentioned in the Purāṇas on the same or similar occasions. It also mentions, side by side with peoples like the Pārasīkas (verse 60) and Yavanas (verse 61), the Hūṇas (verse 68) and Kāmbojas (verse 69), which can never justly belong to the time of the poet, not even to a single period of time whatsoever. The Greeks have never been simultaneous neighbours with the Persians; and surely the Greeks have never possessed the North-West Frontier of India in years after the birth of Christ.[26] Further, even if the Hūṇas rushed into India, through Kābul, and possessed the country, still it is not intelligible how a writer who took his stand on historic facts can mention both the subjugators and the subjugated, side by side, as independent peoples.

---

[23] In a recent article on the *Romaka Siddhānta*, in *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XIX;, pp. 133 ff., S. P. Dikshit goes still further and fixes the time of Ptolemy, 150 A.D.;, as the *terminus ad quem* for the older *Romaka*. Thibaut also says, *loc. cit.*, pp. lii-liii, that the *Romaka* can be older than Ptolemy, although there lies no conclusive ground for this supposition; cf., in this connection, Burgess, *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XIX, p. 287.

[24] Cf.;, for instance, *Viṣṇudharmottara*, I. 29. 16f.—
tvad-bimbe nirmale pṛthvī sa-śaila-vana-kānanā | 16
śaś-ākṛtiḥ sadā dṛsyā śaśa-lakṣm-āsyato='nagha |
ten=eva kāraṇena tvam=ucyase mṛga-lāñchana || 17

[25] *On the Age of Kālidāsa*, pp. 30 ff. (Inaugural Dissertation), Berlin, 1890.

As for other so-called arguments for the supposition that Kālidāsa belonged to the sixth century, I pass them over; because they are open to similar and even greater objections than those discussed above. I do not believe that the question of the time of Kālidāsa and of other leaders of Indian poetic art, whose dates have not been fixed by actual historical documents, will make an essential advance, by such methods as have been followed up till now, by most of the Sanskritists. In order to arrive at certain conclusions, we must thoroughly investigate the language, style and poetical techniques of single works and compare them with those of works whose dates have been known with certainty or with approximate definiteness, and of epigraphical documents, as well as with the canons laid down in the older manuals of poetics. If we will extend the scope of our work to the epics also, we will be able to have quite a complete picture of the gradual growth of Indian poesy. Such investigations, of which a beginning has been made, especially in the works of Jacobi, naturally fall outside the limit of this essay whose only aim is to point out, in a general way, the significance of the study of inscriptions for the *kāvya* literature.

---

[26] [For the Greeks in records of the second and third centuries, see Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I, 1965 ed., pp. 177, 204, 525. For foreign rule in Eastern India, Cs. Sircar, Some *Problems of Kuṣāṇa and Rājpūt History*, pp. 52 ff.—D.C.S.]

certain conclusions, we must thoroughly investigate the language, style and poetical technique of such works and compare them with those of works whose dates have been known with certainty or with approximate definiteness, and of epigraphical documents, as well as with the canons laid down in the older manuals of poetics. If we will extend the scope of our work to the epics also, we will be able to have quite a complete picture of the gradual growth of Indian poetry. Such investigations, of which a beginning has been made, especially in the works of Jacobi, naturally fall outside the limit of this essay whose only aim is to point out, in a general way, the significance of the study of inscriptions for the *kāvya* literature.

INDEX

Acchavanta 66n
Agastya 21
Ahīnagu 13
Aihole 4
Aihole-Meguti inscription 4
Ājuna 66n
Ākhyāyikā 34
Alakā, city 18, 93
Alaṅkāra 49, 55, 63, 66, 76 ; *śāstra* 63, 66, 77
Allahabad 6 ; *praśasti* 55, 86
Ambarīṣa 73
Ambu 38
Amṛtadatta 38
Ānandavardhana 28
Ananta 52 and n
Andhra 34
Antaka 46
Anuprāsa 57, 68
Anuṣṭubh 11 ; *śloka* 82
Aparamegha 18
Aphsaḍ *praśasti* 70
Arjuna 23, 73
Arth-ālaṅkāra 58, 60
Arthavyakti 62
Ārya 47
Āryā 11-12
Āryabhaṭa 91
Āryāvarta 47
Asaṅga 91n
Asirgadh 8
Aśoka 27
Asura 23
Aśvaghoṣa 82-83
Babylonian record 53n
Bactro-Pali 53
Baithana 63
Bālaka-Hari 47
Bāṇa, Bāṇa-bhaṭṭa 3-4, 17, 41, 46, 69 72-73, 76
Bandhuvarman 9, 12-13, 24, 31, 80
Beal, S. 83
Bendall, C. 83
Berar 3, 79
Bhadrāyanīya school 63, 67
Bhagavānlāl 53n, 54n, 62n
Bhaṇḍārkar, R. G. 5, 51, 65n
Bhānugupta 7
Bharata 61n
Bhāravi 4
Bhartṛhari 82
Bhāskara 14
Bhāskarācārya, N. 82n
Bhāū Dājī 51, 64
Bhīmasena 73
Bhitari 7
bhūmi 17
Bhūta 74
Bhuvana-vinyāsa 94
Bihar 7
Bilhaṇa 74, 93
Bilsad 6
Brahman 15, 41
Brāhmaṇa 1, 15, 21, 34
Bṛhaspati 23, 46
Bṛhatsaṁhitā 4, 16, 21
Buddhacarita 82-83
Budhagupta 7
Burgess 92n
Campā 34
Cāndaka brothers 86
Caṇḍīśataka 3
Candra 8
Candragupta II 5-6, 32-33, 40, 42, 75, 87

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

Cāraṇa 16, 74
Caṣṭana 50, 53, 59, 61, 63, 85
Chanda 49
Chatrapa 53
Christian era 1, 2,
Cintra inscription 90n
Citoḍa 50n
citra 62
Cunningham, A. 85n
Dadhikarṇa, Nāga prince 86
Dakhiṇāpathesara 67n
Dakṣa 7
Dakṣamitrā 85
Daṇḍaka 43
Daṇḍin 12-13, 23, 40, 57, 61-63, 76, 79
Daśakumārcarita 34
Daśapura 8-9, 11, 17, 22-23, 31, 88
Daśapura-Mandasor 9, 77, 87-88
Dhanada 46
Dhanyaviṣṇu 17
Dhārā 49
Dholpur inscription 89
Dhruva 51n
Dhruvabhūti 34
Dhruvaśarman 6
Dhvanyāloka 28
Diamouna 50n
Dignāga 90-91
digvijaya 93-94
Dikshit, S. P. 5, 92
Dinīka 85
Drutavilambita 11
Dvārakā 20
Erāṇ 7, 87–88
Fergusson 87, 89
Fleet, J. F. 1-2, 5-6, 10, 15, 25, 29, 31-33, 35, 40, 46, 87
gadya-kāvya 55, 67, 76
gadya-padya 60-61
Gaṇadāsa 32
Gandharva 15-16, 46, 74
Gaṅgā 36-37
Gangdhar 7
Garuḍa 48, 74
Gauḍa school 12, 79 ; style 70
Gauḍavaho 46
Gautamī Balaśrī 67, 75
Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi 64, 65n, 67
Gaya inscription 89n, 90n
Ghsāmotika, 53n
Girnār 34, 50 ; inscription, *praśasti* 50, 54, 56, 63, 67-68, 77 and n, 78, 83, 86
Godāvarī, river 64
Goparāja 7
Govardhana district 65
Govinda II, Rāṭhor (Rāṣṭrakūṭa) king 70
grantha 7
Greeks 94 and n
Gujarat 9, 17, 34, 52, 84, 87 ; Northern 52n
Guṇāḍhya 4
Gupta—dynasty 2, 4–7, 33, 40 : era, year, saṁvat 5-7, 51 and n ; inscriptions 2, 5, 50, 93-94
Gwalior 8, 84, 88
Hāla 4
Hara 214
Hariṇī 11
Hariṣeṇa 6, 8, 33-35, 38-43, 46-48, 57-58, 76, 78, 86 ; his *praśasti* 50, 83
Harṣacarita 3, 17, 34. 46, 70
Harṣavardhana 3, 60
Hemacandra 21, 45, 74
Himālaya 68, 84
Himavat 23
Hiuen-tsang 91n
Hoernle 87n, 88n
Hultzch 89
Hūṇa 87, 89 and n, 93–94
Huth, G. 92
Huviṣka 85
India 2-3, 8, 40 ; North-Western 53
Indian—poet 23 ; *kāvya* 2

Indo-Scythian 53-54, 64
Indra 35, 46
Indravajrā 11
Īśānavarman 70
Īśvarā, princess 75
Jain 2
Jamunā 50n
Janamejaya 73
Jasdan pillar inscription 51n
jasmine 25, 45
Jayadāman 59, 85
Jayasiṁha Siddharāja 74
Junāgaḍh, Junāgaṛh 7
Junāgaṛh-Girinagara 50
Junnar inscription 64
Jyotirvidābharaṇa 90
Kabul 93-94
Kādambarī 13, 34, 69, 72 and n
Kahaum 7
Kailāsa, mountain 22, 37, 75, 93
Kalaśa, 93
Kālidāsa 3-4, 13, 18-20, 22, 27, 32, 41, 44, 71, 79-81, 87, 89-94
Kalyāṇī 49
Kāma 27-28, 71
Kamboja 94
Kaṇaswā inscription 89n
Kanauj 3, 40, 46, 49
Kaṇheri 34
Kaṇiṣka 83, 85
kānti 61
Karle inscription 64, 85
Kashmir 34, 38, 49, 93
kathā 34
Kāṭhiāwāḍ 34, 52, 64, 84, 87 ; Northern 52
Kautsa-Śāba 32
Kavirāja 49, 78
Kavi 86
Kāvya 3-4, 6, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20-24, 27-29, 31, 33, 39, 44, 46-49, 63, 65, 83, 87 ; Classical 77 ; literature 50, 55, 61, 78, 95 ; Prakrit 66 ; Sanskrit 66 ; style 57, 78, 82
Kāvyādarśa 13-14, 23, 40, 61-62
Keśava 73
Kesavājuna 66
Khādyaṭapākika, Khādyakūṭapākika 34 and n
Khakharāta family 64
Kharoṣṭrī, Kharoṣṭṛī-lipi 53, 64
Khatrapa 53
Khshathrapāvan 52n
Kielhorn 1, 80-82, 89n
Kinnara 14-15
Kirātārjunīya 27
Koṅkaṇ 64
Koṣa 49
Kṛṣṇaka 39
Kṣaharāta clan 64
Kṣatrapa, Kshatrapa 52-53
Kṣemadhanvan 13
kulaka 25
Kumāra 34
Kumāragupta I, 6, 9, 22, 70, 79, 87
Kumārajīva 91
Kumārāmātya 78 and n
Kumārasaṁbhava 27, 81n
Kuṣāṇa 94n
laghu 62
Lākhāmaṇḍala *praśasti* 14, 75 and n
Lakṣmī 70
Lassen 83
Lāṭa 9, 11, 17
Liaka Kusulaka 53n
līl-āmbuja 62
madhu 27
mādhurya 61 and n
Madra 7
Māgha 20
Mahābhārata 73, 94
Mahābhāṣya 4, 81, 82
mahākāvya 10-12, 82
Mahākṣatrapa 52, 54 ; Rudradāman 50
Mahārāja 53-54
Mahārājādhirāja 35
Mahāśabda 54

Mahāsāmanta 53
Mahāvīra-Vardhamāna 2
Mahendrapāla 1
Mahī 52n
Mahīpāla 1
Mālatī 81
Mālava 7, 17, 25, 45 ; era, saṁvat, year 6-7, 88 and n ; *gaṇasthiti* 88n
Malavikāgnimitra 32
Mālinī 11
Mallinātha 90
Malwa 33, 52, 84, 87-88
Mānasa lake 93
Mānavadharmaśāstra 47
Mandākrāntā 11, 39
Mandara, mountain 69-70
Mandasor 7–9 ; inscription of 472 A. D. 80n ; *praśasti* 87
Mathurā 5, 84-87 ; inscription 5, 85
Mātṛceṭa 8
Mātṛviṣṇu 7
Maukhari dynasty 8
Max Müller 83, 86, 91–92
Mayūra 15
Mayūrākṣaka 6
Meghadūta 18, 80-81, 90
Meguti temple 4
Meherauli pillar inscription 8
Mercury 21
Meru 70n
Meru-Madara-pavata-sama-sāra 68
Mihirakula 8, 88 and n, 89n
Moga 53n
Mūlarāja 69 and n
Muses 78
Nābhāga 73
Nabhas 13
Nāga 16
Nahapāna 64, 65 and n, 84-85
Nahuṣa 73
Nanjio, Bunyin 91
Nārada 16, 46
Narasiṁhagupta 87
Narmadā 21
Nāsik inscription 64-65, 68, 70, 75, 77n, 84-85 ; *praśasti* 77
Nasik-Poona region 65n
Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata 61n
Navasāhasāṅkacarita 73
Nāyikā 16
Nine Jewels 90n
Nirgrantha 2
Nītiśāstra 72
ojas 61n, 62, 67
Okhāmaṇḍal pillar inscription 51n
Ouzegios 66
Ozene 50
pada-saukumārya 61n
Padmagupta-Parimala 74
Paitāmahasiddhānta 92
Paithan 63
Palāsinī, river 59
Pāli 65
Pañcasiddhāntikā 4, 92
Paṇḍit, S. P. 49, 92
Pāṇini 82
Pārasika, people 94
paraśu 41
Pāriyātra, king 74-75
Pāriyātra, mountain 75
Pārtha 23
Pārvatīpariṇaya 3
Paśupati 36
Pāṭaliputra 32, 40
Patañjali 81-82
Pauliśasiddhānta 92
Persians 94
Peshawar 85
Peterson 34
Piśācīpadraka, village 67
Plutus 78
Prabhāvakacarita 21
Praharṣiṇī 81
Prajāpati 46
Prakrit 3, 46
Pramitākṣarā 81
prasāda 62
Pratiṣṭhāna 64

Pravarasena 4
Prinsep 38
Prīti 21
Pṛthvī 39
Ptolemy 50, 56, 63, 65, 92n
Puḷumāyi 65, 67
Puṇḍarīka 13
Puragupta 87
Purāṇa 15, 92-94
Pūrugupta 87n
Puruṣapura 85
Pūṣan 16
Raghu race 13, 73, 93
Raghuvaṁśa 14, 20, 24, 69, 71, 74, 92-93
Rājādhirāja 54
Rājan 52-53
Rājarāja 54
Rājaśekhara 1
Rājātirāja 54
Rājendrakarṇapūra 38, 45
Rajput 94n
Rājputānā 34 ; Eastern 84
Rākṣasa 74
Rāma 20, 73
rasa 13
rasavat 61
Rati 21
Ratnadharmarāja 91
raudra-rasa 13
Revā, river 21
Ṛkṣavat, mountain 66 and n
Romakasiddhānta 92
Ṛṣabhadatta 85
Ṛtusaṁhāra of Kālidāsa 26, 80n, 81 and n
Rudradāman 34, 51, 54 and n, 59-61, 63-64, 77 ; his inscription 50
Rudrasena 51
Rudrasiṁha 51
rūpaka 76
Śāba 32
Śabdālaṅkāra 57
śabda-samaya 62 and n
śabda-śuddhatva 62n
Sagara 73n
Sahasya 25
Sāhi 85
Śaka era 51 and n, 52, 55, 64-65
Sakaladakhiṇāpathesara 67
samādhi 61n
Samadhigatapañcamahāśabda 54
Sāmanta 53-54
samatā 61n
Śambhu 32, 38-39
Śaṁkara 73
Samudragupta 5-6, 8, 33, 35-37, 40-42, 44-47, 49, 60, 87 ; Parākramāṅka 87
Śaṅkara 7
Sarasvatī 44
Śārdūlavikrīḍita 11, 39
Śārṅgadhara 26
Śārṅgadharapaddhati 26, 28, 39
Śārṅgin 20, 25
Śātakarṇi 65, 72-73
Śātavāhana dynasty 4
Satrap 52
Saura 15
Savitṛ 15
Scythian 84
Śeṣa, serpent prince 19-20, 39, 71
Shihābuddīn 38
Siddha 15-16, 45, 74
Siddhānta 91-92
Siddharāja 74
Siṁhapura 75
Sind 84
Sindhurāja 74n
sinduvāra 27
Sircar, D. C. 5, 10, 13, 15, 25, 30, 32n, 34n, 41–42, 94n
Siro-Polemaios, Siri-Polemios 63
Śiśupālavadha 20
Śiva 15, 46, 74
Si-yu-ki 91
Skandagupta 7, 79 ; Kramāditya, Vikramaditya 87

śleṣa 76
sphuṭa 62
Sragdharā 39
Śrī 44
Śrī-Puḷumāyi 63
Strī-rājya 93
Stūpa 85
Subandhu 4, 21, 41, 73, 76
Subhāṣitāvali 24, 38-39, 81n
Sudarśana lake 50, 54, 65, 77, 84
Śūdraka, king 69, 72
Śukra 23
sukumāratā 62
Sumeru 22
Suranadī 39
Surāṣṭra 52
Sūrya 92
Sūryaśataka 15-16
Suvarṇasikatā, river 59
Suviśākha 52
Svāmin 52
svayam-adhigata-Mahākṣatrapa-
    śabda(*nāman*) 54 and n
Tapasya 27-28, 30
Tāranātha 91 and n
Terrien de la Couperie 53n
Thanesar 3
Thibaut 91
Tiastanes, king 50
Tiatoura 50n
Tilabhaṭṭaka 34
ti-samuda-toya-pīta-vāhana 72
Tomara clan 41
Toramāṇa 7, 88, 89n
Tripathagā 37
Triraśmi mountain 75
Tumburu 46
udāra 62 and n
udāratā 61n
Udayagiri 6-7, 32
Udepur *praśasti* 72n
Ujjain 49, 52, 87-90
Ujjayanta 50
Upajāti 11
upamā 76
Upendravajrā 11
Urjayat, mountain 50, 59
Usabhadāta 64n, 56n, 85
Uṣavadāta, same as Usabhadāta
    85-86
utprekṣā 76
Vaidarbha school 79 ; style 77
Vaidarbhī 13, 40-41 ; *rīti* 50, 61
Vākpati 46-47, 93
Vallabhadeva 81n
Vaṁśastha 11
Varāhamihira 2, 16, 21, 90-91
Vara-vāraṇa-vikama-cāru-vikama 71
varṇ-ānuprāsa 58
Varuṇa 46
Vasantatilakā 11, 81
Vāsavadattā 21, 34, 70n, 73n
Vāsiṣṭha 92
Vasubandhu 91 and n
Vāsudeva 85
Vāsula 7
Vatsabhaṭṭi 7-15, 17-21, 23, 28-30,
    33, 39, 80-81 ; his *praśasti* 79-80
Veda 21
Vedic language 56
Vidarbha 3
vidvas 49
Vidyādhara 74
vihāra 85
Vijhachavanta 66
Vikramāditya 5, 74, 87, 89-90
Vikrama era 8, 87, 88 and n
Vikramāṅkacarita 26, 93
Vikramorvaśiya 27, 44
vimāna 19-20
Vindhya 21, 23
Vindhyarkṣavat 66
Vīrasena 6, 32–33
Viṣṇu 8, 15, 20, 41, 47
Viṣṇudharmottara 92n
Viṣṇuvardhana 7, 88
Viśvavarman 6, 9, 23-24
Vivasvat 16

Vyākaraṇa 49
Western—Deccan 64 ; Kṣatrapa 51n
Yakṣa 74, 93
Ysāmotika, *Mahākṣatrapa* 53
Yaśodharman 7, 88
Yaśodharman-Viṣṇuvardhana 7, 88-89
Yaśovarman 8, 46, 93
Yavana 94
Yayāti 73
Yogin 15-16

CORRECTION

Page 94, note, line 3.— *Read*—Cf. *for*—Cs.

OUR PUBLICATIONS

1. *Indian Feudalism, C. 300-1200* by Prof. R. S. Sharma, 1965, pp. 319. Price Rs. 15.00.

2. *Land System and Feudalism in Ancient India,* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1966, pp. 140. Price Rs. 7.50.

3. *Paurāṇic and Tāntric Religion* by the late Dr. J. N. Banerjea, 1966, pp. 188. Price Rs. 12.50.

4. *The Śakti Cult and Tārā* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1967, pp. 180 with 9 plates. Price Rs. 10.00.

5. *Kṛṣṇa in History and Legend* by the late Dr. B. B. Majumdar, 1969, pp. 307. Price Rs. 20.00.

6. *Bhārata War and Purāṇic Genealogies* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1969, pp. 197. Price Rs. 10.00.

7. *The Bhakti Cult and Ancient Indian Geography* edited by Prof. D.C. Sircar, 1970, pp. 225. Price Rs. 12.50.

8. *Foreigners in Ancient India and Lakṣmī and Sarasvatī in Art and Literature* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1970, pp. 192 with 9 plates. Price Rs. 12.00.

9. *Early Indian Indigenous Coins* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1970, pp. 176 with 2 plates. Price Rs. 12·00.

10. *Social Life in Ancient India* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1971, pp. 170. Price Rs. 12·00.

11-13. *Journal of Ancient Indian History* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, Vol. I (1967-68), 1968, pp. 346 with 6 plates ; Vol. II(1968-69), 1969, pp. 433 with 7 plates ; and Vol. III (1969-70), 1970, pp. 450 with 14 plates. Subscription Rs. 20·00 payable in advance ; back volumes each Rs. 30·00.

14. D. R. Bhandarkar's *Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1968, pp. 81. Price Rs. 10.00.

15. E. W. Hopkins' *Social Position of the Ruling Caste in Ancient India : The Status of Woman* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1969, pp. 89. Price Rs. 10.00.

16. *Prācyavidyā-taraṅginī* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1969, pp. 540 with 49 plates. Price Rs. 60.00.

17. *Some Problems of Kuṣāṇa and Rājpūt History* by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1969, pp. 120. Price Rs. 20.00.

18. A. K Coomaraswamy's *Origin of the Buddha Image* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1970, pp. 100. Price Rs. 12.00.

State Museum Library Lucknow